

THE  
SATURDAY REVIEW  
OF  
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 978, Vol. 38.

July 25, 1874.

[Registered for  
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

MINISTERS AT THE MANSION HOUSE.

MR. DISRAELI and some of his colleagues dined with the LORD MAYOR on Wednesday, to the great satisfaction of both parties. The LORD MAYOR had just been made a baronet, Mr. DISRAELI having judiciously kept back till the morning of the banquet the announcement that this consummation of the happiness of a Lord Mayor had been bestowed on Mr. LUSK. In proposing the health of his host Mr. DISRAELI found many pleasant things to say. The LORD MAYOR gives princely entertainments, has a remarkably genial face, has signalized his mayoralty by the happy thought of giving a special dinner to persons of distinction in literature and art, and is, for the week at least, the newest of all new baronets. In return the LORD MAYOR could state with confidence that Mr. DISRAELI is a most remarkable man, that there never was a cleverer Cabinet than the present Cabinet, and that the country is delighted to see the LORD MAYOR and his political friends in a minority, and this constellation of first-rate stars shining in place of Mr. GLADSTONE and his colleagues. But these personal matters were naturally only the garnish to the main dish. The central point in the entertainment was the speech in which Mr. DISRAELI described the action and aims of his Ministry. Some recollection of his morning's work seemed to hang over Mr. DISRAELI's mind. He was in that peculiar state of finding an excitement in making small things grand which becomes a man who has just made one more baronet. He took in succession each of the more prominent deeds or intentions of his Ministry and made a baronet of it. He invested it with a mild halo of mysterious dignity. He made the most of it by giving it a title the exact value of which no one can appreciate. Of what the Ministry is going to do it was no doubt easy to speak in this way. Mr. DISRAELI is always dreamy, poetical, grandiloquent when he deals with the future. But it was in the description of what the Ministry has done that the real baronet-making element shone forth. The humble measures which Mr. DISRAELI selected for glorification were the poor little Licensing Bill and the Factory Bill adopted from Mr. MUNDELLA. These were quite typical in their way. If we may speak of measures as of men, we may say of these Bills that they are of the sort which come to London with half-a-crown in their pockets and begin by sweeping out the shop. And now they are all of a sudden turned into Lord Mayors and baronets. The title given to the Licensing Bill was that of "a redressing of the grievances of a class that had suffered under previous legislation." Mr. CROSS, who was present, must of all people have most keenly enjoyed this idealization of a Bill allowing public-houses in the metropolis to be kept open half an hour, or, as he says, practically twenty minutes, later. Mr. MUNDELLA's Bill was raised to rank and fame under the designation of "a great measure which completes the factory legislation of this country." This glowing language showed the extraordinary fertility of resource which distinguishes Mr. DISRAELI in the department of distributing honours. Every one who heard Mr. DISRAELI speak must have felt that a Prime Minister who could talk like that was equal to making a baronet of anybody.

The Ministry, as Mr. DISRAELI remarked, does not intend to be an idle Ministry, and next Session it will produce measures more original and on a larger scale for the purpose of improving the condition of the people. But Mr. DISRAELI was far too prudent to go into details, and his hearers were probably quite satisfied with the assurance that he had got the thirty millions of our home population in

his eye, and was not without some thoughts of extending the British Empire. He reserved himself for topics of greater if vaguer interest. He described, if description is the right term to use, the ecclesiastical and foreign policy of his Cabinet, and if we gather nothing else from his statement, we at any rate gather that it is a very grand policy indeed. The contest between the spiritual and temporal powers which in other days has raged so fiercely is now on the eve of breaking out in a new form. The forces, he tells us, on both sides are not unequal; but to be forewarned is to be forearmed, and the Ministry, which sees the important issue in all its bearings, feels itself not unequal to the task. By the course which the Ministry will recommend Parliament to follow, and by the measures which it will be instrumental in carrying, the Ministry trusts that it will remove such evils as exist, and such dangers as are to be feared. If this great battle of Armageddon is coming off, every honest Englishman will of course be glad to have a long-sighted Ministry to take care of us all, and a statesman at the head of affairs not incompetent to arrest the progress of spiritual domination. But if these great forces are really gathering up their strength for a supreme struggle, and if the strength which each can command is so nearly equal, it is puzzling to think how apparently slender and inapt are the means by which the issue can be decided in favour of good government and wholesome liberty. The two measures on which Mr. DISRAELI relies are the Scotch Patronage Bill and the Public Worship Regulation Bill. With these weapons in his hand Mr. DISRAELI can meet his spiritual foes. But if these are the only weapons he needs, he is at least like the chosen shepherd going out against a giant with nothing but a sling and a few smooth stones out of a brook. If the GOLIATH of spiritual tyranny disappears before the blow of the Scotch Patronage Bill, he cannot be such a very dreadful sort of giant. It seems not only such a mere pebble, but a pebble of the wrong sort to pelt him with. Its object is to take patronage out of the hands of educated laymen and give it to congregations under the guidance of spiritual courts; and it would have seemed as if this was rather an encouragement to the giant than a blow to him. As to the Public Worship Bill, Mr. DISRAELI informed his hearers that the Ministers have felt it to be their duty to "grapple with that mysterious disturbance which has now for no inconsiderable period perplexed and annoyed the people of this country." This, it must be allowed, is to describe Ritualism in a very handsome way, and the Ministry may be supposed to have been not indisposed to make their antagonist as big as possible in order to gain credit by demolishing him. Mr. HARDY as he listened must have felt that the duty of grappling with a mysterious disturbance was one to which he had but very recently been alive. Strange to say, it appeared to outsiders as if it was not any perception of the recurrence of a new Armageddon that determined Mr. DISRAELI to support the Bill of a private member for grappling with this disturbance, but simply the discovery that the House of Commons cared more about the matter than the Government thought probable. So different are the external actions of wise men from their inner counsels that the first conclusion of uninstructed judges as to the two great measures of the Cabinet for combating spiritual tyranny would have naturally been that the first rather told the wrong way, and that the second was taken up almost by chance, and under a gentle pressure.

When Mr. DISRAELI was describing his ecclesiastical policy there was at any rate some clue to his meaning.

By a mysterious disturbance he meant the Ritualists, by grappling with it he meant the speeches of Mr. HARDY and other members of the Cabinet on Mr. GURNEY'S Bill. But when he came to describe the foreign policy of the Ministry we are lost altogether. The Cabinet is going to do something, and we feel from the words used that it is something unusual and creditable; but what it is, and when it is to be done, there is nothing to give even the tiniest suggestion. There must be things going on in Europe, if Mr. DISRAELI is right, of which no one outside the Foreign Office and the Cabinet has an idea. And yet with provoking irony he spoke as if he was only saying what every one knew. He took it for granted that his audience was perfectly aware that some of the most favoured regions of Europe, nations that have done most for the world, are in a state of anarchy, or bordering on anarchy. The only country to which the language would have seemed in any way applicable is Spain, which has been going downhill steadily for about three centuries. Spain is certainly in a state of which it is a compliment to say that it is bordering on anarchy. But where else is there anarchy? By a great stretch of language the term might perhaps be applied to France and Turkey. If so, it is interesting to know what the Government is going to do. Fortunately Mr. DISRAELI was able to state that all these anarchical countries, whatever they may be, especially love, admire, and respect England, and the Ministry is somehow going to take advantage of this for their benefit. It is, as Mr. DISRAELI expressly said, going to do more than offer empty words. It is going to exercise the influence of England to preserve peace, and to assist by sympathy and counsel several distracted and distressed States. Spain is torn with a civil war. France, though perfectly tranquil, is unable to fix definitely on a form of government. Turkey just keeps itself alive by borrowing more than it can pay. Which of these offer any very promising field for proffers of sympathy and counsel? It would be very sound advice to the Spanish Government to make military arrangements that would prevent a town within eighty miles of the capital being captured by the enemy. A wise friend might suggest to the French Government that the sooner the Assembly was brought into harmony with the nation the better. A prudent financier might whisper to Turkey that loans raised at a ruinous rate of interest in order to cover deficits produced by extravagance and maladministration cannot last for ever. Words of wisdom might, no doubt, be spoken in all these quarters, but they would be words, it is to be feared, as empty as words could be. The Spanish Government would reply that it did not want advice, it wanted an army the generals of which did not go careering all over the country in pursuit of their private ends, and the soldiers of which were fit to fight. The French Government would reply that, if people in Paris have not the slightest notion what to make of the Septennate, people in London are not likely to be better informed. The Turkish Government would reply, with the Claimant, that it is for fools to find money and for wise men to spend it. If Mr. DISRAELI'S utterances were to be taken in anything approaching to their literal sense, we should seem to be on the eve of a new reign of meddling and muddling. But there is not the slightest real danger of this. We have heard of the spirited foreign policy of the Conservatives, and we now hear of their mysterious foreign policy. But we know what it all means. It means nothing but Lord DERBY at the Foreign Office.

#### THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT AND THE RULES OF WAR.

IT would probably be unjust, as well as discourteous, to doubt the good faith of the Russian Government in proposing an International Conference at Brussels. Prince GORTCHAKOFF'S elaborate project, though it seems to have been originally connected with a philanthropic scheme for improving the condition of prisoners of war, has the wider scope of a code which, if it were adopted, would regulate on all points the practice of belligerents. The proposed body of rules consists for the most part of declaratory enactments giving a formal and permanent sanction to usages which have been virtually established in the practice of civilized nations. It may be doubted whether the embodiment in a statute of the unwritten common law would tend to mitigate the hardships of war, but the contention of the Russian Government that the rights and duties of belligerents should be strictly defined is intelli-

gible and plausible. The objection to a diplomatic treatment of the entire subject is founded on the probability that the States which might take part in the discussion would be actuated by a regard to their own special interests as well as to the alleviation of human misery. There is a certain oddity in the phrases with which Prince GORTCHAKOFF introduces his project of a code. According to his statement the community of feeling and interest which tends to unite nations as members of one family renders it necessary to make elaborate provision for the conduct of their quarrels with one another. All men, or all Europeans, are brothers, and therefore it is expedient to regulate the conditions of mutual fratricide. No great Continental State can be accused of negligence in the material provision which it has to make for reciprocal slaughter. The Russian Government has within two or three years established an elaborate system of universal military service which will enable it to place more than a million of men in the field. Germany, Austria, France, and Italy, with the minor Powers, will make up the roll of armed brethren to not less than four millions. As all these fraternal armaments can have no object except that the several disciplined multitudes should in certain contingencies put one another to death, it is perhaps natural to arrange that the most internecine conflicts shall be conducted with all possible regard to the general convenience. It is undoubtedly well that modern wars are for the most part not conducted after the fashion of WALLENSTEIN'S campaigns in the Empire, or of LOUIS XIV.'S invasion of the Palatinate. General SHERMAN'S march through Georgia is the latest example of a military operation directed chiefly against the property of the non-combatant population.

There is no novelty in the prohibition of the use of poison, which indeed is only employed by savages, or by those who, like the backwoodsmen in some parts of the United States, have adopted the belligerent ethics of the savages who are their habitual enemies. Prince GORTCHAKOFF has not thought it necessary to forbid the taking of scalps, which is practised on both sides in the border warfare of the Far West. The use of projectiles filled with powdered glass and of explosive balls of less than a certain weight had been already prohibited by agreement. The exceptions to the general rule of burning, killing, and destroying are dictated by an anomalous benevolence; but there is no objection to new rules of the game of war which discourage unnecessary torture, and which in some instances give the adversary a kind of sportsmanlike fair play. There is no rule against starving 100,000 people to death in a besieged town or against burning them out with red-hot balls. It is not lawful to make use of the enemy's flag, of his uniform, or of his military insignia for purposes of deception; but nearly every other kind of warlike stratagem is legitimate and laudable, though Sir GAENET WOLSELEY sternly censured the poor King of ASHANTEE for pretending peaceful designs when he was really preparing for battle. Spies are liable to be shot, though their occupation may be meritorious and honourable; but an ancient exemption protects officers who run the risk of collecting information within the enemy's lines without putting off their uniform. Travellers in balloons, employed in keeping up communication between different portions of the hostile army, are entitled to be treated as prisoners of war. On these and many other points Prince GORTCHAKOFF'S code is merely a digest of the existing rules of war. It is possible that regulations founded on general consent might be useful in restraining the violence of obstinate and passionate officers who may be entrusted with commands. The neutrality of hospitals and ambulances has been recently instituted, and it is not likely to be disregarded by civilized armies. The project properly provides that the neutrality should not be compromised because hospitals may be protected by pickets or sentinels who, if captured, would of course become prisoners of war.

The novel and questionable principle of limited liability in war is not likely to be established in the face of Lord DERBY'S judicious protest. The members of a Joint-stock Company in recent times are not liable for the debts of the association beyond the amount of their uncalled capital. The creditor has full warning of the extent of responsibility of the shareholders; and he has no reason to complain of being compelled to resort for a remedy to his demand on the corporate fund. It can scarcely be contended that the subjects of a belligerent State are wholly irresponsible for a war which may perhaps be unjustly aggressive. The



mob and the demagogues of Paris frightened NAPOLEON III. into a rupture with Germany, as their predecessors had a quarter of a century before incessantly denounced LOUIS PHILIPPE for maintaining friendly relations with England. The Germans rightly felt that the quarrel was national; and they consequently displayed no peculiar rancour against the EMPEROR or his advisers. As a general rule, subject to many exceptions, it may be admitted that operations of war on land should "be directed exclusively against the forces and means of making war of the hostile State," and not against its subjects, as long as the latter do "not themselves take any active part in the war"; but if the rule were adopted in the terms proposed in the Russian draft, the capture of an enemy's property at sea would, notwithstanding the uninterrupted practice of ancient and modern times, be summarily abolished. The introduction of such a provision into a proposed code of rules for mitigating the hardships of war fully justified LORD DERBY in the undisguised suspicion with which he regards the entire scheme. The House of Lords fully approved the passage which he quoted from his despatch to the English Ambassador at St. Petersburg, to the effect that the English Government is firmly resolved not to enter into any discussion of the rules of international law by which the relations of belligerents are guided, or to undertake any new obligations or engagements in regard to general principles. It is a further condition of the mission of an English delegate to the Conference that it shall not entertain directly or indirectly any proposal relating to maritime warfare. The Duke DECAZES has since stated to the French Assembly his intention of adopting the same policy with England. The Austrian Government disapproves of almost every part of the Russian project, and intimates an opinion that the discussion is unseasonable, and that it is likely to be barren of results.

Mr. LUMLEY, the British Minister at Brussels, has been informed that he is to take no part in the Conference, and that England will be represented, if at all, by a military officer who will in all cases refer to the Foreign Office for instructions. The promoters of the scheme will perhaps answer objections to their proposal that war should be conducted exclusively by the armed forces on either side by referring to later clauses which modify the sweeping character of the original exemption. An army of occupation is of course entitled to levy from a conquered district the taxes due to the hostile Government; and it might be plausibly contended that, as legitimate administrators of the sovereign authority, they may also levy additional taxes. The army may also take possession of "provision, clothing, boots, &c."; but it is recommended that the generals should either pay for the articles which they require or go through the decent ceremony of "giving" the customary receipts. The enemy may further, without either payment or signature of receipts, levy money contributions on the population, either in case of necessity or by way of penalty, but "care must be taken to avoid ruining the population." SOULT and DAVOUT would probably have alleged necessity in excuse for the boundless sums which they extorted from the Prussians, both for their private use and for the service of their military chests. That they stopped short of finally and totally ruining the population may perhaps be shown by the present flourishing condition of North Germany. If the Emperor of RUSSIA thinks it worth while to prosecute his philanthropic enterprise, he will probably be able to secure assent to the greater part of his proposals. The principal Governments seem likely to follow the example of England in allowing themselves to be represented at Brussels by military officers. The absence of professed diplomatists will deprive the transaction of political significance, and the EMPEROR will enjoy the credit and satisfaction of attaching his name to a compilation of the comparatively humane rules of war which have been introduced in modern times. If the Conference fails, nearly all the rules suggested by Prince GORTCHAKOFF will be in force in the future as in the past.

#### THE ENDOWED SCHOOLS BILL.

IN securing the consent of the House of Commons to the clauses abolishing the Endowed Schools Commissioners, Mr. DISRAELI has carried only a subordinate part of the measure which was expected by his party, and which his Government introduced. The clauses which have been postponed relate to a very serious and important

question. As regards the necessity for some amendment of the Endowed Schools Act, the testimony of one of the Commissioners appointed under it, Mr. ROBY, is tolerably conclusive. "I think," he says, "that Clause 19 leaves out 'an immense number of endowments which, according to 'any ordinary rules, must be considered to belong to the 'Church of England.' The general tendency of Mr. ROBY's opinions, as expounded before the Select Committee of last year, adds to the force of this admission. He thought that it would be "comparatively unobjectionable" to provide for instruction in the doctrines of the Church of England in schools founded since 1700, but he himself earnestly desired that the requirement for religious teaching should point not to "matters of theology," but to "life and practice." In another place, he says that in his judgment the requirement should be for "instruction in the Holy Scriptures." These passages and others like them may help to explain the disinclination of Government to renew the powers of the Commissioners. The views expounded by Mr. ROBY were generally prevalent in the Commission, and the result was that its proceedings came to be regarded with distrust and dislike. It may be that the Commissioners personally deserve all that their friends have lately said of them; but it may also be that their corporate action was influenced by minds stronger and less scrupulous than their own. The effect of the combined action of the Commissioners and the Education Department was adverse to the Church, and as the powers of the Commission were originally granted for three, or at most four years, there is nothing unreasonable in the refusal of Ministers to renew them. The "Conservative reaction" of which we hear so much was largely produced by distaste for the views as to religious teaching which Mr. ROBY and his colleagues applied to grammar schools. Four years of their proceedings is thought to be enough, and it is idle to make a grievance of the non-renewal of their powers. It must be remembered that the Report of last year contains a moderately worded censure of the Commissioners, which was moved by Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, and adopted almost without opposition by the Committee of which Mr. W. E. FORSTER was Chairman:—"It is to be regretted that 'some of the changes proposed by the Commissioners, 'especially in the cases of certain good schools, should 'have been such as to hinder the hearty co-operation of 'those who had heretofore worked to render them efficient.' It would have been easy for Mr. HARDY to have made out from the evidence before the Committee a case for even a stronger censure. Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH proposed a draft Report declaring that "a more judicious course of action" by the Commissioners would have led to much greater results than had actually been achieved by them. There is, to say the least, considerable support for this opinion, and it is natural that the Government should give effect to it.

The necessity of some amendment of the 19th Section of the Act was proclaimed, as we have seen, by Mr. ROBY, and a recommendation for such amendment was inserted in the draft Report proposed by Mr. FORSTER. An amendment to Mr. FORSTER's proposal was moved by Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, and, on a division, the voting was 9 to 9, and Mr. FORSTER, as Chairman, gave his casting vote for his own proposal. Now the principal question which arises on the present Bill is identical with that which was decided in the Select Committee by the Chairman's casting vote alone as lately as the 17th of June, 1873; and yet it is pretended that this question has been settled finally, and ought not to be reopened. The question is, whether certain tests of Denominationalism should be applied only to schools founded after the Toleration Act, as was proposed by Mr. FORSTER, or to all schools, as was proposed by Sir MICHAEL HICKS BEACH. It is conceded by both parties that this question was open until the 5th of August last, when the Amendment Act was passed, and it is contended by one party that this question is not open now. We must remember that towards the end of last Session it was strongly asserted that the House of Commons did not represent the country, and subsequent events have shown that this assertion was well founded. It would thus appear that a question of high importance which one party in the House alleges to have been finally settled was settled without having been submitted to the judgment of the country at all.

It was forcibly observed by Mr. FAWCETT that there is something in the case of educational institutions which money cannot purchase. "The wealth of the wealthiest could not

"suddenly call into existence a Trinity, a Christchurch, or a Balliol," and the same remark applies to the ancient and famous schools which are affected by this Bill. They are in fact places where the religious teaching of the Church of England is now afforded, and you cannot obliterate that feature without impairing the character of the institution. As was well said by Sir STAFFORD NORTH-COTE, the object of the Bill was to preserve that feature. "What the Government did intend was that religious instruction should be given in these schools, and that that religious instruction should be in accordance with what appeared to be the intention of the founder." It must be remembered that many of these schools have chapels which, by an express provision of the Endowed Schools Act, are reserved to the Church of England. Under that Act, as worked by the Commissioners, the absurd result might have been attained of a secularized school with a chapel belonging to the Establishment. The truth is that on this question facts are too strong for theory. When the Commissioners were brought face to face with facts they were constrained to admit their stringency. We have already quoted the opinion of Mr. ROBY as to the 19th Section of the Act. Lord LYTTLTON stated to the Select Committee that the result of that section had been "nothing less than an absurdity." The Commissioners, he said, had been led to apply the section to a disposition made by founder A because he happened to use words which came plainly within its terms, and to refuse to do so in the case of founder B because he did not happen to do so, "while all the time no human being could doubt that A and B meant the same thing." The third Commissioner, Canon ROBINSON, said that "unquestionably many foundations fall outside the section, though the founders took especial precautions to stamp on them a distinctive Denominational character." If the facts of these cases be considered in a judicial spirit, it will be impossible to avoid arriving at nearly the same conclusions as were reached by the Court of Chancery before the passing of the Act. Lord SELBORNE, being Attorney-General in 1866, stated before the Schools Inquiry Commission that, if a school had been founded to bring up children in secular and religious learning, the founder being a Churchman, that would show that religion was part of the object of the school, "and the presumption is that religion means religion according to the Established Church." It is for the opponents of the Bill to displace this presumption if they can. There has been some talk lately about a difference between the "National Church" and the "Church of the Nation," and it is, as we understand, suggested that the existing Establishment is the former, but not the latter. But, if so, what then? Until the "Church of the Nation" be forthcoming, the presumption must continue in favour of the National Church. Lord SELBORNE said further:—"The schools founded by King EDWARD VI. out of the dissolved chantries, and so forth, almost all of them contained indications of an intended connexion with the Church of England, or with religion, which, though I believe for the most part there is no express direction as to religious instruction, yet have been held in many cases to be sufficient proof that they were to be Church of England schools." This passage would apply to the case of Birmingham School, which has been so much discussed. We quote it not for the purpose of justifying all the provisions of the Bill, but in order to show that some such Bill was necessary. We believe that no judicial mind could apply itself to the facts without arriving at the conclusion which that passage expresses. But, be that as it may, if the Charity Commissioners consider the questions which come before them, as they are capable of doing, in a judicial spirit, the result is likely to be satisfactory. There is also a point which cannot be overlooked, and the Bill properly proposed to advert to it. We mean the usage since the foundation of the schools. Upon this subject the Report of the Schools Inquiry Commission ought to be conclusive:—"In all but a very few of these schools religious instruction has been regularly given since their first foundation; that is, in some cases, for upwards of three hundred years, and to exclude it now would be a very different thing, and would have a very different effect, from not introducing it for the first time." It is only necessary to add that the religious instruction here mentioned is that of the Church of England; and it would seem reasonable to provide, as the Bill did, that the usage of Church teaching shall be preserved for the benefit of scholars belonging to the Church.

Religious partisanship has a wonderful effect in disabling even clear-headed men from reasoning. Mr. FORSTER was the author of the Act of 1869, which provides that a school shall be a Church school if the instrument of foundation requires the scholars to be instructed according to the doctrines or formularies of the Church. The present Bill provides that, if the instrument of foundation requires the scholars to go to church, it shall be held to require them to be instructed according to the doctrines or formularies of the Church, and Mr. FORSTER considers this a "dangerous assumption." It has been decided by the Commissioners that a requirement to "learn the Catechism" makes a Church school under the Act of 1869; but Mr. FORSTER contends that a requirement to go to Church ought not to make a Church school. Mr. FORSTER seems to suggest that there is danger to the Church from possible claims of other denominations. But our legislation is quite sufficiently unintelligible without deliberately refusing to allow to words their ordinary meaning. Let Parliament first endeavour to construct some rational definition of a Church school, and then let it proceed to settle fairly the position and rights of Dissenters in such school. It is rather hard to accuse the Church of intolerance and the Parliamentary majority of tyranny, when all that the Bill did was to ascribe to language its necessary sense. It is not the stronger party which has been *supra grammaticam* in this debate. All those protests against converting an exception into a rule were directed against fact, law, and reason.

Under these circumstances, it is unfortunate that the Government should not have had the courage to insist upon the securities with regard to religious teaching which they originally proposed. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of the pledge which has been given, that the clauses now withdrawn will be presented next year in a revised form; but a large class throughout the country will look anxiously for its fulfilment. Mr. DISRAELI cannot fail to perceive that the reunited Conservative party of 1874 cannot be kept together without adequate respect being shown to the religious element which so conspicuously contributed to the results of the general election.

#### THE FIJI ISLANDS.

ALTHOUGH the proposed cession of the Fiji Islands has not been finally accepted, it may be assumed that the Government has determined on annexation. On the same day on which Lord CARNARVON made a statement on the subject Mr. DISRAELI disputed the accuracy of Mr. M'ARTHUR's assertion that the acceptance of the cession had been communicated to the House of Lords. He probably intended only to guard himself against any admission which might compromise future freedom of action. It is not to be supposed that the PRIME MINISTER intended to repudiate the declarations of the COLONIAL SECRETARY. At the Mansion House on Wednesday last Mr. DISRAELI perhaps caused some surprise by the declaration that his Government would not only maintain the existing Empire, but perhaps enlarge its boundaries. As there is assuredly no question of extension of territory in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America, Mr. DISRAELI can only have referred to the South Pacific region, and specifically to the Fiji Islands. There is some force in the objections which are raised to the annexation, inasmuch as it will probably not directly pay its expenses, while it will involve a certain amount of trouble and responsibility; but the preponderance of opinion among those who are competent to judge seems to be in favour of the proposed measure, and the Australian colonies unanimously approve of the policy of the Government. It is even stated that New South Wales is willing to contribute to the cost of the operation, and Lord CARNARVON not unnaturally expressed a feeling of gratified surprise on hearing of the possibility that any colony should take a share, however small, of a burden incurred for its benefit by the United Kingdom. It would not be safe to rely too confidently on the rumoured liberality of New South Wales. The revenues of the Fiji Islands will, according to an official estimate, meet the expenses of government, and at the worst the cost of a small Crown colony may be borne for a time without serious inconvenience. It is worth while to incur a moderate liability for the sake of putting an end to an anomalous and embarrassing relation. The islands are already to a great extent under the control of English subjects, and the naval officer commanding on



the station has occasionally found it necessary to interfere for the maintenance of order and of peace.

In accordance with established precedent, the English Government is compelled to exercise superintendence over the emigration of labourers which constantly tends to degenerate into a kind of slave trade. As long as the harbours of the islands belong to an independent authority the necessary supervision is imperfect and troublesome. It is said that some of the ports will be useful for the accommodation of vessels trading between the Australian colonies and the western coast of America. As the greater part of the shipping employed is English, some jurisdiction must be exercised over the seamen and adventurers who are likely to frequent the islands. The Commissioners who were directed to report on the state of Fiji suggest the necessity of establishing a Consular Court if the Government declines to accept the sovereignty of the country. The general administration of justice in the name of the QUEEN will be more efficient, and perhaps it may not be more expensive. One main reason for including the islands within the limits of English dominion is the possibility that some other Power might sooner or later have established itself in the country. The French have at different times been disposed to extend their influence in the South Pacific, and some of the settlers in Fiji have already invited the American Government to take possession of the territory. Although it has hitherto not suited the purpose of the United States to acquire outlying possessions, some American politicians, including the actual PRESIDENT, have strenuously advocated a more aggressive policy. It is not impossible that the Sandwich Islands may within a short time be annexed to the United States, and if a colonial system is once instituted, it will admit of rapid expansion. The objection to the acquisition of the islands by a foreign Power is founded, not on idle jealousy, but on the risk of jealousies and possible collisions which might at any time compromise friendly relations. Thirty years ago a quarrel between an English Consul and some French missionaries in another group of islands in the Pacific nearly produced a war between France and England. It is better for all parties to avoid too close a neighbourhood.

The Report of Mr. LAYARD, who is Consul at Fiji, and of Commodore GOODENOUGH, commanding on the station, is an interesting document. There are nearly two hundred islands of different sizes, of which about eighty are inhabited. The climate and soil appear to be healthy for English settlers, whose children thrive, although they are not so robust as at home. Nearly all zymotic and pulmonary diseases are at present unknown; and the debilitating effects of heat are principally shown by the approximation of the inhabitants to the American or Australian type of settlers of European descent. It would appear that the natives have, at least in the present generation, been maligned by common report. With the exception of a few thousands of mountaineers, belonging probably to a more primitive race, the islanders have entirely discontinued the practice of cannibalism, and, to the great credit of the missionaries, they have, with few exceptions, become Christians. It is stated that an enumeration which has been made by the missionaries of the number of attendants at churches and chapels constitutes almost a complete census of the population. The men never omit to come to church; and the women are in the habit of bringing their infants and other children. The schools are well conducted and adapted to their purpose, and the Commissioners recommend that the Government should encourage the establishment of a Training College which has been projected for the sons of chiefs. The failure of missionary efforts in some parts of the world has been so frequently noticed that the perfect success which has been achieved in the Fiji Islands ought not to be overlooked. If the islanders should by some strange good fortune escape the consequences which have elsewhere resulted from the contact of inferior races with the Europeans, the merit of their progress in civilization will belong far more to their disinterested religious teachers than to the most zealous and beneficent of civil administrators. Christianity is most easily and most effectively propagated among tribes which still retain something of the simplicity and docility of children. As might be expected, a large admixture of former Paganism qualifies for the present the perfect orthodoxy of the converts. One of the most valued privileges of members of the same tribe is that they have a right to curse one another, or rather to curse the fathers,

the grandfathers, and the gods of those with whom they may happen to quarrel. It is not consistent with etiquette, or perhaps with the maintenance of peaceful relations, to execrate the ancestors of strangers.

The white settlers some years since elevated a native chief of the name of CAKOBAU to the rank of constitutional King, with some of themselves as his Ministers. The Commissioners believe that a chief of another group of islands is equal in power to the titular KING; but luckily MAAFU concurs in the proposal that the islands should be ceded to the English Government. The actual Minister, Mr. THURSTON, attaches, in the name of the KING, an elaborate system of conditions to the cession of sovereignty. Lord CARNARVON has properly declined to accept any but an unconditional surrender of power; but there is no doubt that the KING and other holders of vested interests will be justly and liberally treated. The islands will be formed into a Crown colony in which all real power will belong to the Governor, though, as usual, there will be a Legislative Council, in which some of the chiefs will have seats. The tenure of land is, as in all primitive communities, widely different from that which prevails in England or in Europe. The Commissioners think that in one sense all landed property belongs to the chief, subject to the rights of the members of his tribe, who owe him certain services on account of their holdings. Since the arrival of white settlers, the possession of land in fee simple has been introduced, but it would seem that the system is still unintelligible to the natives. In some instances a chief whose rights are rather those of lord of the manor than of freeholder has assumed the right of selling the property which belonged in part to the actual occupier. Questions of this kind have been widely studied of late years, and a judicious Government will not be disposed to disregard native habits or modes of thought. The Commissioners recommend that the quasi-feudal position of the chiefs should be recognized, to be afterwards gradually abolished or altered. It is not expected that Lord CARNARVON's refusal to entertain the plan of a conditional transfer of sovereignty will imperil or delay the annexation. When it is accomplished, the first and most important duty of the COLONIAL MINISTER will be to select a Governor of intelligence and firmness. The class of retired Indian civilians forms the best school of colonial administration, and some of them, still in the vigour of life, might be glad to exchange compulsory idleness for a suitable field of action.

#### MARSHAL MACMAHON AND THE REPUBLIC.

MARSHAL MACMAHON has had great opportunities and has greatly missed them. Circumstances have given him an extraordinary influence over the course of events in France, and a certain honest absence of ambition has saved him from using that influence in the interests of his own aggrandizement. But though this latter quality has kept the Marshal an honest man, it has not been able to make him anything but a very narrow-minded one. It might have been a worse misfortune if he had wished to found a dynasty, but it is a very great misfortune that he should have wished to found nothing. For the political pilot statesmanship is as essential as honesty; it takes something more than good intentions to keep a ship off the rocks. In the first instance it was not necessary that Marshal MACMAHON should be himself a statesman; all would have gone well if he could have recognized the gift in others. When the secret history of the overthrow of M. THIERS by a Parliamentary vote comes to be made public, it will probably be discovered that Marshal MACMAHON was the pivot of the negotiations which gave the victory to the Right. If he had taken no part in them, still more if he had let it be known that he was on the side of M. THIERS, it is doubtful whether the Duke of BROGLIE would have been able to command a majority, and still more doubtful whether a majority, if obtained, would have done him any real good. Among the Conservative deputies there was a good deal of alarm at the prospect of a Republic, but it was an alarm which could scarcely have borne practical fruit had it not been shared or favoured by Marshal MACMAHON. Supposing that M. THIERS after his defeat on the 24th of May, 1873, had pursued a similar policy to that which the Marshal is pursuing now, the hostile majority would speedily have melted away. He might have refused to accept the resignation of his Ministers, or he might have replaced

them by others equally devoted to himself. He might then have hurried on the partial elections, and relying on the evidence afforded by them that he possessed the confidence of the country, he might simply have waited until the consciousness of their own weakness brought the Conservatives to see that their best policy was to make friends with the President, and to accept a Conservative Republic. To the carrying out of this policy one thing was wanting. An Executive may rightly resist a Legislature, provided that it has the country at its back, if only it can resist successfully. But it cannot resist successfully unless it has unity in itself, and with Marshal MACMAHON at the head of the army the French Executive would not have had unity in itself. If M. THIERS had offered a passive resistance to the vote before which he retired, the Duke of BROGLIE would probably have followed it up with a vote of deposition; and if M. THIERS had disregarded this vote and refused to retire until after the electors had been appealed to, Marshal MACMAHON, judging from his subsequent conduct, would have executed the decree of the Assembly against the PRESIDENT. Against this certainty it would have been useless for M. THIERS to struggle. With the constituencies to fall back on he might have fought a Parliamentary majority, but the constituencies would have served him nothing when the Parliamentary majority had in its service the master of the legions.

Marshal MACMAHON had a second opportunity when he became President. It is conceivable that many timid Conservatives may have distrusted M. THIERS's power to give the Republic that Conservative hue which he maintained it ought to wear. They may have bethought them of former Radical excesses, and asked themselves why the Girondin of 1873 should look to be more fortunate, either as regards his own head or those of his friends, than the Girondins of 1793. But a movement which had on its side a Conservative army under the virtual command of a Conservative President could afford to take a Republican direction, and after the collapse of the Legitimists last October, it ought to have been clear even to men of ordinary political capacity that this was the only direction in which movement was possible. If Marshal MACMAHON had had the wisdom to reject the dangerous counsels of the Duke of BROGLIE, and to insist on regarding himself as President of the Republic for the first seven years of its existence, a working Ministerial majority might by this time have been formed in the Chamber which would have been so far in accord with the Republican majority out of doors as to be sure of obtaining a complete ratification of its acts whenever the day of a general election should arrive. The Duke of BROGLIE could not have resisted an alliance between Marshal MACMAHON and the Left Centre. He would simply have resigned office some months earlier than he did resign it. The Conservatives in the Assembly would have regretted their leader, but they would not have espoused his cause after the Chief of the State had disowned it. Instead of this the Marshal became as much an admirer of the personal Septennate as the Duke of BROGLIE himself. His own position could be no greater under a Provisional Government than under a settled Government; either way the first place was secured to him for seven years. But the Marshal had persuaded himself that, after an interval spent under his rule, Frenchmen would, by some unexplained process, be better qualified to decide upon their own political future than they are now, and in this conviction he supported the efforts of the Right Centre to found a personal Septennate.

Still fortune was kind, and the Marshal had again an opportunity of learning the late wisdom that sometimes comes by sheer experience of folly. He had pledged himself to the Conservative majority, and the Conservatives kindly released him from all obligations to them by ceasing to be a majority. The Right of the Assembly is now agreed upon nothing but negatives. Each of its sections hates the others only less cordially than it hates all the sections of the Left. The Left, if it had the support, or could even secure the abstention, of Marshal MACMAHON, would be in a position to establish the Republic. The Right, even with the support of the Marshal, can establish nothing. Yet to this impracticable combination of impracticable opinions the Marshal so far adheres that he will not hear of the only expedient which could give him real Parliamentary support. If on Thursday General DE CISEY had accepted

the CASIMIR PÉRIER proposal, an effective majority would at once have been created. The Marshal would not have lost a single element either of power or dignity which he now possesses; on the contrary, his position as the inevitable and indispensable ruler during the early years of the Republic would have been more assured than ever. Three-fourths of those who would have voted with M. CASIMIR PÉRIER would have done so with an unexpressed admission that it was the presence of the Marshal at the head of affairs, and the securities for order involved in his presence there, that made the establishment of the Republic possible. Marshal MACMAHON has rejected this source of strength, and has chosen to regard himself as invested with an anomalous authority which no one can either label or define. General DE CISEY's declaration comes to this, that the one thing needful for France is Marshal MACMAHON. Other politicians have gone as far as to hold that Marshal MACMAHON is a necessity for France, but the only creed that satisfies the PRESIDENT of the Republic is one which goes on to say that nothing else is necessary. "The Government," says General DE CISEY, "do not think the true remedy for the sufferings of the country would be the actual proclamation of the Republic. . . . The country wants you "to give the existing power the necessary strength to "defend and protect itself." By what means General DE CISEY has arrived at this interpretation of the wants of the country it is impossible to say; but we may be allowed to suspect that to his soldierly mind the country and his superior officer are identical terms. That the necessary strength to defend and protect himself is what Marshal MACMAHON wants is evident. He has advanced a good deal nearer a dictatorship since he first took office, and even since the 20th of November. Or perhaps it may only be that, now that he no longer represents a homogeneous party in the Assembly, the real absolutism of his position is more clearly seen. It would not be fair to say that the Marshal was prepared to disregard the decision of the Assembly, supposing that it had gone in favour of the CASIMIR PÉRIER proposal, but he must have an extraordinary amount of moral conservatism if he can retain a virtual dictatorship without contracting that contempt for representative bodies which is the characteristic sentiment of dictators, and for which the action of the present Assembly gives so much room. It is probable, however, that this particular temptation will for some time be spared him by the Assembly continuing to reject any proposal to which the Marshal expresses dislike.

#### ELECTION PETITIONS.

THE disposition to bribe and treat electors is so firmly implanted in the minds of many candidates and their friends that the one question which, as it appears, presents itself to those who are in the midst of a contest is too often how the law may be evaded. That bribery and treating are now very risky things is well known. The days of a Man in the Moon and bags of gold in a dirty public-house are over. Open public-houses with unlimited beer and joints for all comers are things of the past. But, short of these overt violations of the law, there are an infinity of small attempts to see what can be done safely; and it is accepted as indisputable that anything that can be done safely may be done properly. Of course there are numerous constituencies in which there is no bribery or treating, and if there is intimidation, it is of that quiet sort arising from the influence of wealth and rank on humble neighbours which it is very difficult to prevent, and which sometimes is not unconnected with feelings that practically do much to bind society together. In other constituencies there is a real political issue raised, and even if there were a disposition to bribe or treat, it would be recognized that such means would be useless, and that the contest would really be decided by the opinions or passions of the electors. When, again, men of high political position stand, they are determined on discountenancing every form of corruption, and even their most foolish supporters are aware that it is better for such men to lose an election than to win it by means of a doubtful kind. But in a considerable number of constituencies the only real issue is whether a man who has tried to make himself locally agreeable or formidable, and who is known to have money, shall receive a personal advantage



in the shape of a seat in Parliament, or whether another man of the same sort is to beat him. It is a struggle as to which of two private persons is to have a prize, and the combatants, or those who are working for them, take every advantage that the law allows. They are playing a game, the rules of which they are willing to observe, for not to observe them is to win in vain; but they set themselves to think very closely what the rules of the game are, and will hazard something in the hope that it may perhaps come within the rules. They have a profound belief, which is often justified by the facts, that their adversaries are doing exactly the same thing, and it would be to confess a humiliating inferiority in cunning if they were to be beaten simply because they had been outwitted. Then comes the petition, and the Election Judge arrives. He examines into what has been done, and stops up the little hole which it was hoped the law had left open. He unseats the member, and one more point in election law is decided. Gradually the limits in which candidates and their friends can work with safety are narrowed, and if the constituencies will only be good enough to furnish a sufficient number of leading cases, the law will ultimately be so settled that honesty will actually be discovered to be the best policy.

Some recent decisions have done much to contract the liberty in which knowing electioneers thought themselves entitled to move. The instance of Boston is perhaps scarcely worth referring to, as an electioneering agent must be a baby if he thinks that he can give sacks of coals to six or seven hundred electors with impunity. But the instances of Stroud and Kidderminster are worth studying. The Conservative member for Stroud was unseated because his friends had taken far too wide a view of what might be done by a judicious payment of travelling expenses. The payment of these expenses is not illegal, and if it is necessary that this should be so, all that can be said is that the necessity is an unfortunate one. But it is illegal to pay the expenses as a condition of voting in favour of the person paying, and it is still more obviously illegal to pay more than the actual expenses, and so give the voter a bonus. At Stroud both these mistakes were committed; but it was hoped that the payment of the excess might be safely covered and concealed if payment was made in postage-stamps. They seem to come from nobody, no order for payment is given, the recipient gets them in the quietest and most comfortable way, and can dispose of them by driblets. The elector has paid five shillings for his railway fare, and he gets a sovereign's worth of stamps, and he does not know exactly how the account has been made out, or to whom he ought to return the balance. Nothing could be more ingenious, or seem a better stroke of local genius, until the Election Judge arrived, and then the little device was made to seem unspeakably silly, and the member was unseated. At Kidderminster, Mr. GRANT set himself avowedly to work to see what he could do to please and conciliate the electors without infringing the law. He conceived that a tea and fireworks, with a procession of supporters wearing appropriate rosettes, and decorated with a medal that should stamp the image of their triumphant member on their minds for ever, would be the right thing; only the feast must be delayed, not only until the election was well over, but until the time for petitioning was past. He was elected after having held out hopes to the electors of this splendid recognition of their services in getting him into Parliament. He then set to work to fulfil his promise, and sent down considerable sums of money for the preliminary preparations. Subsequently, however, he seems to have been aware that there was more risk in carrying out his scheme than he had supposed; and the great feast was never held, and the rosettes and medals were never exhibited to the gaping and admiring crowds of Kidderminster. But he had already done too much. Down came the Election Judge, and investigated with unpleasant minuteness all that had happened. Mr. GRANT did his utmost to oppose his enemies. His solicitors and agents would not acknowledge to having any documents connected with the election, and Mr. GRANT forbore to go into the witness-box to explain the purity of his intentions. The Judge does not appear to have had much difficulty in arriving at a conclusion. There were the facts, that prior to the election a great feast had been promised, and that subsequently to the election money had been sent down to pay for the preparations. So Mr. GRANT lost his seat just as the electors had lost their tea and medals.

and a general cloud of disappointment lowered over a borough which, if things had been a little better managed, might have been so happy—might have had Mr. GRANT for its member, and might have had thousands of pounds' worth of rockets, and tea, and ribbons, and metallic images of its worthy representative.

Not to give hundreds of sacks of coals away, not to send postage-stamps for bonuses beyond travelling expenses, and not to promise gorgeous teas are lessons that future candidates and their agents are now bound to take to heart; and it cannot be said that there is much difficulty in learning them. But it must be said, in justice to those who have taken part in contests at recent elections, that election law is not formed solely through decisions on cases where clever people have tried to see whether they could not find a loophole through the meshes of the law. In several cases the Judge has had to unseat a member who had done, or whose friends had done for him, something which they honestly thought there was no harm in doing. At Launceston Colonel DEAKIN was unseated because on the eve of the election he had given permission to his tenants to kill the rabbits on his estate. The Judge held that this was bribery, but he took care to add in his report that it was bribery of a sort that reflected no discredit on the briber. It was, in fact, nothing but the effervescence of good nature in a landlord who likes to see people happy around him. It was totally unnecessary for Colonel DEAKIN to notice such miserable little creatures as rabbits. As he had informed Mr. LOPES, the former member, he had become the owner of Werrington, and he claimed as the representative of Launceston the immemorial appanage of his purchase. He was quite right. The people of Launceston are, as a matter of fact, deservedly attached to the proprietor of Werrington, whoever he may be, and the consequence of the decision about the rabbits was simply that Colonel DEAKIN ceased to sit for Launceston, and his son was elected in his stead. At Stroud, a short time ago, the Liberal member was unseated because some of his friends had given an early breakfast of a modest kind in a Nonconformist schoolroom. To offer such a meal, at such an hour, in such a place, is of course treating in the legal sense, for a Judge has held it to be so; but it hardly comes within the popular sense of what a treat means, and the givers of that ill-fated hospitality might be quite believed when they protested that they had not the slightest notion that they were doing wrong. In a more recent case at Stroud the Judge had to decide whether there was bribery under the following circumstances:—At the February election certain millowners who were agents of a candidate gave a holiday to their men on the polling-day, and nevertheless, contrary to the usual practice of the mills, paid them for the day, though they did not work on it. This was repeated at the May election, and it was contended that the establishment of the new practice in February was in effect a promise that this practice should be followed on the next election, and that this promise had been fulfilled. The Judge held that no such promise could be inferred, and he also held apparently that what the millowners had done did not come within the language of the Act as to bribery. But in dealing with an election petition the Judge acts at once as judge and jury, and it is one of the privileges of a jury to be able to say "Not guilty, but don't do it again." This is precisely what Baron BRAMWELL said at Stroud. The millowners were not guilty of bribery, but he strongly recommended them not again to pay their men for a holiday on polling-day. As he pleasantly remarked, if they are so fond of giving holidays, why should they select polling-days at election-time for the sole occasions of their bounty? If they did but select some other day, the men would equally have a treat, and the masters would be sure that they could not be suspected of bribery. This is one of the most useful ways in which the new system of election decisions works. The Judges are gradually teaching the law to the public, and are inspiring prudence as to what looks like a breach of the law among those who do not wish to win by any practices that can be blamed. If purity is to be established in electioneering, it is quite as important that honest people should be made careful as that clever people should find that their devices for just keeping within the law, while infringing its spirit, only end in disaster.

## THE LORDS' COMMITTEE ON CHURCH PATRONAGE

THE Bishop of PETERBOROUGH'S Committee on Church Patronage has made a very sensible Report, which may be summed up in the proposition that it is prudent to let well alone. The alterations proposed in the existing law are trifling, and for the most part unobjectionable. It would perhaps be expedient to extend the bishops' power of refusing institution in cases where bodily infirmity disqualified the patron's nominee from discharging his duty. It is a scandal that a decrepit old man should be appointed to a living for the mere purpose of increasing its saleable value by the probability of his early death. There is also no objection to the suggestion that the presentee of a living should produce a certificate of character from three incumbents in the diocese which he last served, countersigned, if necessary, by the bishop. It was hardly worth while to appoint a Committee of the House of Lords to consider reforms so trifling. Some of the witnesses or supposed experts who were consulted proposed various schemes for checking the existing traffic in livings. On the suggestion that advowsons should be made inseparable from landed estates, the Committee justly remark that such a rule might vest unalienable patronage in a pauper, a minor, or a notoriously unfit person. It was also proposed that a living sold separately from the land should be offered to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or the Trustees of Queen ANNE'S Bounty; but it is a preliminary question whether it is desirable to diminish the amount of private patronage. Only a few years ago Lord WESTBURY passed, with general approval, a Bill for enabling landowners to purchase the advowsons of small livings in the gift of the Chancellor. The purchase money was in all cases to be added to the endowment; but it must be assumed that Parliament would not have facilitated the transfer except on the supposition that private patrons would exercise their power for the good of the Church. No notice is taken in the Report of an intermediate kind of patronage which has been invented for the purpose of propagating certain doctrines. Mr. SIMON, who was fifty years ago a leader of the Evangelical party, left a considerable sum in trust for the purchase of livings, which were to be presented to disciples and partisans of his own. If such devices were to become common, it would perhaps be right to prevent by law the diversion of ecclesiastical revenues from their proper purpose for the benefit of any particular sect. A private patron may be expected to prefer his friend or his kinsman, and bishops must, for the purpose of the argument, be supposed to take merit into consideration. A trustee for the encouragement of doctrines which may at any time become obsolete occupies an anomalous position.

If private patronage had been hitherto unknown, it would certainly not now be deliberately introduced; but the same may be said with equal truth of many of the best English institutions. The House of Lords, or perhaps the Crown itself, would not be created for the first time if the community had to provide itself with a Legislature and a Government, and yet more than one country in Europe is at present vainly striving to provide itself with an Executive and a Second Chamber. In early times nothing seemed more natural than that the owner of an estate should have the right of appointing the priest of the parish. The incumbent in his turn possessed a freehold, burdened with the discharge of certain duties in person or by deputy, but otherwise possessing all the attributes of property, except that it could not be transmitted to his heirs. As long as it was held that the distinctive function of a parish priest was to administer the sacraments, his personal merits may perhaps have sometimes been regarded as of secondary importance; yet CHAUCER'S Parson is still the most perfect model of a parochial clergyman. The modern result of lay patronage had never been foreseen. The system has tended to raise or maintain the social level of the clergy, and it has simultaneously or consequently introduced into their ranks a proportion of men of sense and men of the world. A peer or the squire of a parish who happens not to possess strong ecclesiastical propensities, prefers a nominee whom he likes or respects often in a large degree on secular grounds. It by no means follows that a clergyman will be less pious because he is not exclusively selected on account of his piety; and in all other respects the qualities which fit men for temporal employment are of the highest value in

the discharge of spiritual functions. The brother or the nephew of a patron may perhaps not always be an eloquent preacher; but in the majority of cases he is a gentleman. The clergy in those parts of the country where advowsons are commonly attached to landed estates are at least as popular as those in the same or other districts who owe their preferment to bishops. The sale of livings which shocks some sensitive Churchmen and a much larger number of Dissenters who take a speculative interest in the subject is an almost necessary incident of private patronage. It would be extremely difficult to prevent the transfer for valuable consideration of any kind of incorporeal hereditament which possesses a money value. The columns of ecclesiastical newspapers which are devoted to lists of livings on sale have perhaps a not thoroughly edifying appearance, but the worst part of the process ends with the advertisement. The man who buys a living for his son or even for himself gives a certain security that the future incumbent will be inclined to submit to the restraints of a clerical life, and to perform the duties of his office. The mode of appointment is not perfect, but it is incomparably preferable to popular election, and it adds a wholesome variety to episcopal patronage. The House of Lords Committee fully appreciates the numerous advantages of the system.

The Bishop of PETERBOROUGH will, in a future Session, easily carry in the House of Lords, and perhaps in the House of Commons, a Bill for providing the moderate securities against improper appointments which have been devised by his Committee. A resident patron is for the most part strongly interested in the selection of a creditable nominee; but there are undoubtedly cases in which the right of patronage is abused. The Committee were restrained from going further in their recommendations by the obvious risk of collision with proprietary rights. The evil, whatever may be its extent, is largely reduced since the abolition of pluralities. The character of a rector who was destined to be a permanent absentee was not likely to be strictly scrutinized. The Church is becoming less and less a refuge for idlers; and the remuneration which it offers is seldom sufficient to tempt a candidate who is grossly unfit. A large part of the endowment of the clergy practically consists of their own private means; and probably the incumbents who have been presented by private patrons contribute more than their share to the general fund. One of the many reasons against disestablishment consists in the probability that forfeiture of the corporate property of the Church would be followed by the loss of the supplementary revenues derived from birth or from marriage. The strong interest which the upper classes of the community feel in the welfare of the Establishment is to a great extent founded on sympathy with friends and equals, and on the absence of any suspicion that the clergy as a body are disloyal to society. The anomalies which offended the Bishop of PETERBOROUGH when he moved for the Committee on private patronage perhaps appeared to him on closer investigation to be intimately connected with other parts of the fabric of the Establishment. The majority of the Committee consisted of bishops and of laymen who take a strong interest in all matters relating to the Church. Their bias would probably be in favour of episcopal nomination, if they had not been strongly impressed with the advantage of a more varied kind of patronage. The minute provisions which they recommend for adoption are perfectly compatible with the maintenance of the present system. The actual declaration as to simony is absurdly obscure and indefinite, and it would, as the Committee suggest, be more convenient to enumerate in the form of declaration the offences of which the presentee is to profess himself guiltless. It is difficult to prevent the sale of next presentations, because any laws on the subject would in many cases be evaded by the purchase of the advowson and by a subsequent re-sale. The rule which prohibits the sale of a vacant living is in itself reasonable, and perhaps its provisions might be made more stringent. If the mere object of the distribution of patronage were to excite and reward the zeal of candidates for preferment, a practice which in the majority of cases tends to an appointment made on private grounds would not be defensible. The advocates of lay patronage must rest their defence on the working of the system, which, as a whole, is not unsatisfactory. It is well that there are Bishops acute enough to perceive the danger of removing any of the buttresses which help to support the Establishment.



## PUBLIC OPINION AND THE INDIAN FAMINE.

IT is to be hoped that public opinion in England will not fall into the mistake which has overtaken public opinion in India. A letter in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of June 17 describes certain charges brought by Indian newspapers against the Government as amounting to "an imputation that the Bengal officials have, either 'from ignorance or from an anxiety to make the facts correspond with their Estimates, misrepresented the famine.'" One paper in particular, the *Times of India*, is said to have asserted that superior officers "have mutilated the too-outspoken reports of their subordinates, 'have snubbed them for writing unpleasant truths, and 'have warned them against the consequence of un-'pleasantly accurate statements.'" We confess to entertaining a general disbelief in charges of this type. It is exceedingly easy to bring them against public men, and exceedingly difficult for public men to disprove them. Even if every subordinate officer were to deny that his report had been "mutilated," or he himself "snubbed" or "warned," only the form of the accusation would be changed. It would then be said that strong pressure had been brought to bear upon subordinate officers by their superiors, and that under this pressure they had consented to deny what they knew to be true. In cases of this kind the decision must, after all, turn upon the characters of the accused persons. If their previous careers have not led Englishmen to put more trust in the accuracy and the straightforwardness of Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL and Sir RICHARD TEMPLE than in the accuracy and straightforwardness of the anonymous informants of Indian newspapers, no evidence as to the facts is likely to have much weight with them. It may be useful, however, to point out once more that the temptation to mutilate outspoken reports and to snub their too accurate writers cannot extend beyond the Bengal Government. The disposition of the Government of India would be all the other way. Lord NORTHBROOK is in the position of a man who has been ordered to take precautions which he himself thought somewhat exaggerated, and the best proof that he could give the Home Government that he was right in his estimate and that they were wrong would be to send home impartial testimony to the fact that the famine had fallen short of English fears. So far as Lord NORTHBROOK is concerned, his reputation could not be injured if it were shown that the stores of grain provided to meet the wants of the distressed districts have been immensely in excess of the real need. From a very early period in the history of the famine the decision to what extent it should be met was virtually taken out of his hands. He was blamed in many quarters for refusing to prohibit the exportation of rice, and the only defence which was listened to was the plea that he was buying grain enough to feed the whole population that might possibly become famine-stricken, irrespective of any exports whatever. It would have been useless for him to say that he did not believe that more than such and such a fraction of the population would need relief, and that he proposed to make provision for this contingency only; he would at once have been told that in matters of this kind nothing less than certainty can be accepted. So long as it was possible that the outside estimate of the number of persons who could under any circumstances be thrown upon the hands of the Government might prove true, the VICEROY would not have been allowed to take any estimate short of that. To be prepared for the worst was the direction originally sent from the India Office to the Government of India, and when Lord SALISBURY succeeded to the Duke of ARGYLL there was a general expression of satisfaction at the supposed superior energy of the new Minister, and the consequent probability that this policy would be pressed home yet more firmly. Almost the first act of the new SECRETARY of STATE was to direct the purchase of more grain, and it was only on receiving a distinct assurance from the VICEROY that all that could be required had been got, and that if, contrary to all expectation, it should prove insufficient, as much more as was wanted could be had, that Lord SALISBURY consented to suspend his order. There can be no reason therefore why the Government of India should wish to represent the famine as real when it is in truth imaginary; and even if the Government of Bengal were conspiring to keep the facts from their superior authority, it seems unlikely that the Government of India would not possess some means of checking the fortnightly narratives.

Two considerations are involved in the doubts which are

now being thrown upon the magnitude of the scarcity in Bengal. Is the food provided in excess of reasonable calculations? and is any one to blame for mistakes in the original estimate? At present there is some inclination even in England to say "Yes" in answer to the first question, and "The Indian authorities" in answer to the second. There is, in point of fact, no ground for either reply. It is impossible in dealing with a scarcity affecting many millions of persons to provide enough for the highest imaginable requirement without running the risk of providing for requirements which may never be reduced to fact. No one will pretend that the Government of India were in a position last November to say within some tens, or even hundreds, of thousands how many persons would be depending on them for food eight months later. No one will pretend that the Government of India were in a position last November to say within some weeks, or even months, for how long a time the persons depending on them would remain dependent. Supposing that they could not feel sure whether they would have to feed three millions for nine months, or two and a half millions for six months, a large margin of uncertainty is thus created. A population of half a million cannot be kept alive for thirteen weeks without a very large expenditure and so far as this expenditure has to be incurred in advance, there is no avoiding the risk of waste so long as it is unknown whether this half-million will have to be supported after all. If therefore it could be proved that the Government supply of grain is very much in excess of what is now seen to be the probable need, it would not necessarily reflect blame upon those who are responsible for ordering it. Of course excess over actual requirements is *prima facie* evidence of former excess over reasonable calculations, but it is nothing more. The famine could only be met on the scale and with the certainty demanded by the English public by taking an outside estimate, and outside estimates are unavoidably open to be falsified by subsequent events. As yet, however, it would be exceedingly rash to say that the Government provision is appreciably in excess of the need. In the last fortnightly narrative Sir RICHARD TEMPLE says of Tirhoot, "Looking to the 'supplies of Governmental grain *in situ* or in reserve, I 'am still hopeful that there is enough for such emergencies 'and requirements as may be reasonably expected at present. But I have not met any responsible officer of any 'grade who thinks that we have more than enough." The population of Tirhoot will have no fresh rice to eat until December. Those who reason as though the famine were already over seem to forget that the food which is to supersede the Government supply is not yet in the ground.

Whether the proportions of the famine as compared with previous famines have not been exaggerated is another question. In former famines the State did not attempt to keep the whole population alive, and consequently it is quite possible that a famine which, when set aside by side with the famine of 1866, is a mere scarcity, will cost the Government ten times the sum expended in the earlier year. But this only shows that the standard of Government aid has been different in the two cases. It may be fair matter for argument whether the State has been well or ill advised in taking this tremendous burden upon itself; but there is no doubt that on this occasion it did take it upon itself, and that if it had hesitated about doing so, it would have been driven on by an irresistible public sentiment. When the need is past it will be well to consider calmly, and with all the instruction afforded by the experience of 1874, whether in future famines are to be left to take their course, or are to be dealt with by precautionary measures on a large scale, or are to be fought, as this time, in the open field. But after having deliberately resolved to meet the present famine in this last-mentioned way, it is not our business to begin, before the famine is over, to censure the Indian authorities for having done what we told them to do, and to do thoroughly, on pain of something like impeachment and degradation. This kind of criticism is unjust even in Indian newspapers, though they at least never urged the necessity of strong measures. It would be inconsistent as well as unjust in journals which six months ago were never weary of urging Lord NORTHBROOK to spend without stint and almost without thought.

## COLLECTIONS.

THE love of making collections is often early developed. A school boy has a rare assortment of marbles or butterflies before his purse allows him to indulge in stamps or photographs. A now celebrated surgeon is said to have made his first money by a collection of neatly mounted skeletons of mice. The proceeds were applied to the purchase of a series of microscopic slides. Many a fine collection of coins has had its beginning when a child has perceived the difference between a sou and a halfpenny, and has put the foreign money by as a curiosity. To a real collector, the catalogue of a coming sale in his own particular department is more interesting than a new novel or a change of Ministry. A day at Christie's is more to him than the Derby or the Ascot week. Even the misfortunes of his friends are not without aspects of consolation if their collections come into the market. And many who are not collectors read the list of prices in the *Times*, and take much pleasure from the perusal. Some regret may be expressed, perhaps even felt, when the accumulations of centuries in an old family are dispersed. It seems a pity, though it may be useful. But our sorrow is alleviated if we make collections ourselves. The rare Sèvres mark for which we have so long pined is now within our reach. The scarce Aldine or the unique Wynkyn, for which we have sighed in vain, may now perhaps be ours. The Reynolds portraits which have long been admired on the wall of another may now perhaps be transferred to our own, and become as much our property as our great-grandmother herself. Thus we contrive to bear up when others come to grief, and can even see that a benefit is conferred upon mankind by the spendthrift who ruins his own family. He would be adjudged a lunatic or an idiot but for his skill in handicapping, and there are compensating advantages to those who deplore his headlong course and reprehend his extravagance. They at least are wise if he is foolish, and, sternly repressing their feelings, they attend his sale, and lay up treasures which their descendants will probably disperse in turn.

On the whole, collecting judiciously is a safe and profitable method of investment. The collector, especially if he has made his own money, is easily convinced that putting it by is the worst way of saving it. If he lays it out in books and plate and pictures, he finds he may both spend it and also have it, or at least leave it to his heirs. If Mr. Gillott had put his money to usury he could not have made more with it than he did by purchasing pictures; and the pleasure he derived from making his gallery should go for something besides. The mere gratification to be found in looking at the collection, in adding to it carefully, in arranging and weeding out, in criticizing and comparing, is worth a yearly rent to a man who can afford it. If he gives five hundred or a thousand guineas for a painting, it is easy to calculate what it has cost him at the end of ten or fifteen years; and allowing besides for what has turned out badly, it is not very hard to make a simple sum of profit and loss. We should be greatly surprised to find that Mr. Gillott's heirs did not clear both principal and interest on every picture, as well as a handsome percentage by way of profit. And all this without counting the enjoyment of possession, which, by a man of taste, will be valued very highly.

But judicious collecting is not to be learnt in a day. It is a science, and not an easy one. The true collector must not buy what is now the fashion. He must leave that to coalowners and cotton-spinners. He must look forward. When Mr. Barker first bought the early Italian masters they were little known or admired. When Mr. Conser bought his English poets few people had heard of Wither or Giles Fletcher. "Britain's Second Remembrancer" was forgotten, and Mr. Grosart had not edited "The Triumph in Heaven and Earth over and after Death." Sometimes a public event, sometimes a gradual turn in the tide of popular taste, influences the collector's market. A biography or a battle brings a man or a place into prominence. A novel or a law suit illuminates the industry of some obscure corner. A poet is quoted in a Premier's speech. But without the aid of any such fortuitous concurrences, the wise collector, who buys in one direction, and who perhaps makes and prints a catalogue, is certain soon or late to find his trouble rewarded. This is the case with almost all the arts, and literature as well. The collector comes first; the cataloguer comes next; and then the public, having something on which to form their opinion and some guide in forming it, bring the ware, or the school, or the book into fashion.

The various directions in which a man may collect are among the curiosities of the subject. Flint arrow-heads, tobacco-pipes, finger-rings, glass beads, jugs, woodcuts, niellos, and many strange and uninteresting things are gathered, as well as pictures, prints, or books, and the other greater divisions of the arts. One gentleman buys every piece of old music he can find. Another forms a library all of Bibles. A third has every book on the Dance of Death. Bones and fossils, and all the endless range of zoological specimens, form the objects of a large class. In the arts alone, embroidery, lace, watches, furniture, are pursued as much by a limited number of hunters as pictures or china by the general collector. It is by explorers who first enter on a new pursuit that the country must be surveyed and mapped, so that when ordinary travellers come they may easily know their way. The Harleian Collection, the Douce Collection, the Slade Collection, and many more, have thus been formed. It is not until a collector tries to find duplicates that he knows what is rare. He may buy at the very first setting off an edition or an impression which afterwards turns out to be absolutely unique. Some men have capabilities for this kind of pioneering

which are denied to others. They seem instinctively to know when a thing is scarce, and every day adds experience to their natural powers. Such men are born collectors, and are always collecting. The late Mr. Bernal was such a one. Mr. Barker was another. A gentleman now living has successively made the best collections known of Sarum service books, ivories, and silver plate. But it is not always possible to collect more than one kind of thing at the same time. Most collectors can only employ their leisure at the sale-rooms, and use their pursuit merely as a relaxation. It is generally an amateur of this kind who does the most valuable work, for he concentrates his pleasure upon what he gathers. It is the dealer, on the other hand, who follows his track, and is the first to profit by his information. Hardly had the first list of potters' marks been made before the cottages and farmhouses of Somersetshire and Wiltshire were swept by professional men who emulated the pretended uncle of Aladdin in exchanging new and beautiful china and stoneware for the broken parrot or the odd match-pot which had so long stood unappreciated on the chimney-piece.

It can never pay the judicious collector to give sporting prices, except perhaps as an advertisement for his collection. A curious example of this rule was afforded by Mr. Barker's five blue Sèvres vases. It is said that he originally gave two thousand guineas apiece for three of the jars, and that he was long aware that the two which made up the set belonged to an eminent French financier and Minister. One day something went wrong in Rentes, and the pair came into the market. Mr. Barker was on the alert. They were his for five thousand guineas. This made the price for the five eleven thousand guineas, or two thousand two hundred each. No doubt they were a great addition to the collection, a feature of first-rate importance. But such a price was beyond their value, and in the recent sale the whole five only fetched a few hundreds more than Mr. Barker had given for one of them. This is a very instructive example.

Another point to which the judicious collector attends is genuineness. Here again Mr. Barker's collection was unsatisfactory. Some of his Boule, for example, was imitated. No one could tell the true from the false, and both suffered. For though a modern imitation of such merit as to be indistinguishable from the original ought, in theory, to be as valuable, yet for a collector's purpose it is not worth nearly so much. There are copies of Dürer's prints quite equal to the engravings he made himself; but as specimens of his art they are useless. The judicious collector of books, too, will never have fac-simile titles or missing pages supplied. His collection, if he is wise, is above suspicion. There is often a great temptation to make up an imperfect book or "restore" a mutilated picture. But experience proves it to be a mistake. Modern pictures in this respect have an advantage over old ones. It is the same with china. It must be genuine. It cannot be mended, once broken or cracked. In this fact lies the reason of the high prices often given for examples. It requires the smallest amount of judgment on the part of the buyer. He can see at a glance if it is what it pretends to be, and can know in a moment whether it is perfect or not. But bronzes are easily forged, and so are all kinds of palæolithic remains, arrow-heads, celts, deer's-horn, and the rest. It speaks well for the quality of an art that it is difficult to imitate. When the cost of a reproduction is likely to be greater than that of an original example, it is not worth while to make the reproduction. A curious example of this kind is in the recollection of those who visited the first and best of the present abortive series of Exhibitions at Kensington Gore. An ingenious French manufacturer exhibited a pair of enamel jars made exactly like those which come from Japan. But the cost was more than five times as great. Enamels therefore are seldom or never forged. On the other hand, books are particularly obnoxious to the efforts of the imitator. Even illuminated manuscripts are often made up in a way which only the utmost knowledge and experience can detect. Photography and its branches have probably been of great assistance to the professors of these arts. When a library is perfectly free from such deceptions, the effect on its market value is enormous. This it was which caused the exceptional prices of the Perkins' books dispersed last year. Many of them were spotted with damp, and others were very imperfect, but they were absolutely genuine, free from facsimiles, and unended. Sir William Tite's library, which has just been sold, was by no means so immaculate. Much suspicion attached to many of the older printed books, and the whole collection suffered in consequence. The young collector finds it very hard not to "make-up." With the most honest intentions he may do irreparable harm. A recent collector of old editions of the Bible records a case in point. He had bought an imperfect copy of a black-letter quarto, and thought to make it perfect by taking some leaves from another of the same date and size. But, one after another, he bought six copies, and found on comparing them successively that all were of different editions. Six imperfect Bibles, each establishing an edition, were of more importance than one made-up example, no matter how perfect. The late Mr. Offer, whose extensive library of Bibles and early editions of Bunyan was destroyed by a fire at the auctioneer's, is said to have been sadly addicted to making-up, and the destruction of his books was the less to be regretted. The permanent value of a collection depends chiefly on this one sterling quality of genuineness.

The pleasure of making a collection seems to be very great. One of the most curious things concerning it is the anxiety of the collector to get rid of his collection as soon as he has made it. This



desire annually brings under the hammer by far the larger number of the objects whose prices we see in the morning papers. After a man has laboured for years in hunting out from all quarters the specimens of some extinct manufacture, or the paintings of one school, or the prints of one period or country, he is seized with the most ardent wish to disperse them again. If the things he has gathered are rare, and if he has made a good catalogue, and noted circumstances about them previously unknown, he cannot do better, either for himself or the world at large, than submit them to the ordeal of a public sale. It is by the notice thus attracted that fresh classes of art are brought into fashion. The sale five or six years ago of an extensive selection of early German and Italian engravings turned attention to Martin Schöngauer and Marc Antonio Raimondi. And within the last few months as much as seven hundred guineas were given for a single print by one of these masters, and a few days since four hundred for another. It is not many years since their value was not the same number of shillings. These high prices, however, are perilous to the buyer. He cannot count on obtaining the same again. His own competition removed, they would probably not fetch anything like the money. For the buyer in an ordinary sale competes with two sets of opponents, namely, the owners and the bidders. But when it comes to paying such an enormous sum as ten thousand guineas for three pieces of porcelain, which was done a few weeks ago, the ordinary bidder's competition is removed. The vendor alone keeps up the price. He must do it with more or less risk of buying in. If these costly examples come under the hammer again—if they should be sold, for example, by executors who are obliged to realize, and who perhaps cannot buy in—the old price will not be approached. But this kind of collecting is abnormal. It disturbs the natural order of events, and is not to be calculated upon. It is essentially unhealthy, and bears a close relation to plunging on the Turf.

There is no reason that collecting should be thus perverted. On the contrary, there can hardly be a greater safeguard to a young man entering life than the possession of a taste, especially a taste for art. Since the days of Ovid it has been commended, and considering how many boys learn it with their early rules of grammar, it is surprising how few afterwards apply it. About forty years ago a young gentleman, with a moderate allowance from his father, took a fancy to some china at a shop in Hanway Street. He mortgaged half his quarter's income to buy it. His father and his friends, who would not have been the least put out if he had lost twice as much in a bet, looked aghast at the purchase. It was downright madness, wanton extravagance, to give fifty pounds for a couple of trumpery jars. But the same pair was sold at Christie's lately for a sum which paid principal, interest at twenty per cent. for the forty years, and something over. The possession of knowledge is the first requisite in forming a collection, and the habit of acquiring even useless knowledge is not to be despised. Nothing can have a better effect on the growing mind than a conviction, however impressed, that knowledge is money. The judicious collector must know something, if it is only about china pugs or snuff-boxes. And though a little knowledge in an important matter is dangerous, a profound knowledge of what is comparatively unimportant may lead on to fortune. Few men who have distinguished themselves have been without a collection or at least a taste. John Selden formed a library. The Duke of Wellington loved music. One of the greatest of living statesmen is a judge of china. The first financier in Europe collects enamels. The busy man finds his greatest relaxation in such pursuits. Without being frivolous they afford a relief from serious cares. Walpole and Richelieu formed galleries as refuges from affairs of State. It may be a question how far education neglects this subject. The early development of a turn for collecting, which was noticed in our opening sentence, is perhaps worth more consideration from those who bring up children than has yet been given to it. Monograms and postage-stamps may, in this way, be among the civilizing agents of our time.

#### THE MAN AND DOG FIGHT.

A WRITER whose various excursions in search of the horrible and disgusting are tolerably well known to our readers has made a new discovery. The practice of dog-fighting being not sufficiently exciting, the ingenious variation has been invented of a fight between a man and a dog. We cannot say that there is anything very surprising in this statement, though undoubtedly there is something exceedingly disgusting. It is not many years since prizefighting had a more or less respectable social standing. Up to a very recent period cock-fighting was carried on at certain places with scarcely an affectation of concealment; and though dog-fighting, for some reason not very easy to define, is a still more revolting practice, every one who has walked through some districts must have seen dogs whose looks are enough to betray their profession. Indeed it is only a few years since a fight between the champion dogs of England and America took place in New York, and was described with great vividness in one of our newspapers. The enjoyment of such spectacles undoubtedly implies the survival of barbarous instincts which we might have hoped were on their way to extinction. Nobody, however, can hold to that flattering belief who looks at the police reports which come to us from the North. When we find women daily maltreated in the most brutal fashion, and the convicted ruffian let off with the mildest of

penalties, any astonishment at mere cruelty to the brute creation would be entirely out of place. A brickmaker at Manchester lately knocked down a woman in presence of a crowd and then set a dog to worry her. The state of public opinion indicated by such a revolting story is certainly not unfavourable to the existence of dog-fighting. And therefore we cannot share the surprise expressed by some of our contemporaries, though we fully share their indignation at the facts which Mr. James Greenwood has brought to notice. That a man who sets a dog at his wife, and the crowd which sees him do it without interference, should like to see a dwarf fighting a bulldog is surely not a very wonderful circumstance. Nothing, we should say, is more natural. There is a kind of grotesque horror about the latter performance, indeed, which makes it in some sense more significant than the other more commonplace cruelty. The atrocity of such crimes is not to be measured simply by the amount of suffering inflicted. The eccentricity of the performance indicates a thoroughly morbid nature which takes pleasure in deliberately inventing refinements of cruelty. A man who kicks a woman to death is a detestable blackguard; but he exhibits, so to speak, merely the straightforward manifestation of brutal passion. The men who can deliberately concoct such a spectacle as a man and dog fight must have sunk a stage further; because they must have learnt to concoct in cold blood eccentric modes of gratifying the most debasing instincts. Nobody can doubt that such practices, if they exist, should be exposed and put down with a strong hand as soon as possible. This new symptom of a dangerous state of feeling requires energetic treatment; and, so far as Mr. Greenwood has contributed to that desirable end, he has done good service.

We do not know, however, that there is any great object in insisting at length upon a view in which all decent persons are agreed. If the man and the dog could be hanged at each end of the gallows to-morrow, there would be many dry eyes—especially so far as the man was concerned. But we have something else to say in regard to Mr. Greenwood. It is his self-imposed task to investigate the outlying corners of society, and to describe the result of his investigations in graphic language. Now, as we have had occasion to point out, the duty is one which requires some delicacy for its satisfactory discharge. It is desirable that horrors of this kind should be described with sufficient power to force public attention, and at the same time that they should not be described so as to gratify a morbid taste for the horrible. Assuming that Mr. Greenwood acted in perfectly good faith and from the best of motives, let us inquire how far his mode of action was calculated to secure his ends. Two long letters to the *Daily Telegraph*, described as "By Our Own Commissioner," give full details of the scene which he witnessed. The first letter tells us how Mr. Greenwood fell into conversation with the owner of a bulldog, drank with him at a public-house, heard some hideous secrets as to the mode of training fighting-dogs, and made an appointment to see a fight on the next night. He also has a passing glimpse of a dwarf called Brummy, who might have passed for the original of Dickens's Quilp. The next night Mr. Greenwood meets his friend by appointment, and goes with him to a low house. He would not have gone, he explains, to see an ordinary dog-fight, but he thought that there was some mystery about the affair. This suspicion was amply justified, inasmuch as he witnessed a fight between Brummy and the bulldog. The dwarf at last knocks the dog out of time by a blow under the chin; and Mr. Greenwood concludes by saying, "I shall have gone through that horrid spectacle to little purpose if any such tournaments are in future waged at Hanley." We quite agree with him, and it is certainly a question whether he will not have done more harm than good. His graphic description has made a sensation, and been read all over the country; it has supplied thrilling illustrations for a journal which enjoys a certain popularity amongst the students of police reports, and we can have no doubt that the details of the brutality have been carefully perused in countless public-houses with the same sort of interest which in the good old days was excited by the records of prizefights. We are afraid that a morbid curiosity forms no inconsiderable element of this interest, and we may even doubt whether the readers who most enjoy such accounts are not more likely to find a hint of a possible source of amusement than to be simply disgusted by the revelation. We very much doubt, in short, the moral tendency of graphic reports of murders, executions, dog-fights, and the whole class of literature to which they belong. The very proper expression of disgust which closes the narrative does not by any means hinder its application to different purposes. It is more likely to act as a salve to the conscience of the writer than to determine the view which he will take of the transaction. We may, at any rate, safely assume that such descriptions are justifiable only so far as they contribute to the suppression of the horrors described. Let us see, then, how Mr. Greenwood tried to further the ends of justice.

The story was noticed; and the Home Secretary, being questioned in the House of Commons, said that he had reason to believe that the account was substantially correct. We should be glad to know what were the grounds of this statement; but at present we have no means of satisfying our curiosity. Mr. Colam, the Secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, endeavoured at the same time to investigate the subject. Mr. Greenwood, it appears, did not come forward at once. We presume that he was unwilling to expose himself to the possible vengeance of Brummy and his friends in case he should wish to pursue his investigations. At

last, however, he was persuaded to accompany Mr. Colam to Hanley, in order to point out the scene of the outrage, under the condition that the visit should be *incognito*. After some perplexity, he fixed upon a certain street as that in which the fight took place. According to Mr. Colam, the arrangement of the houses was such that none of them could have been the scene of the fight; and, as he says, "Mr. Greenwood has therefore made a mistake in his identification." He was much vexed at his failure, and did his best to help the officer; and he explained that, having been taken by a roundabout way, in a dark night, and in a state of excitement, he had failed to notice any distinguishing feature of the place. This is unlucky; Mr. Greenwood has evidently not the presence of mind of the midwife in the legend of Wild Dayrell, who cut a piece out of the curtain of the bed to mark the scene of murder. As his object was at the time to bring about the suppression of these atrocities, we must regret that he was not more careful to keep his wits about him. Besides, at the hour mentioned in his letter, it is not usually dark on a summer evening. Other facts which might have led to the identification were equally missed. Mr. Greenwood explains that, as he gave the dog a fictitious name, no inquiries after such a name could lead to its discovery. It is not quite easy to reconcile this statement with the mode in which the name of the dog was first mentioned. At any rate, Mr. Greenwood might have revealed its real name, unless, indeed, the noble animal was not thought worthy of a name at all. We might also have supposed that Mr. Greenwood might have identified the man, with whom he had a long talk in broad daylight, whose house he visited, who adjourned with him "to the nearest ale-house," and whom he met by appointment the next night to go to the scene of action. He says nothing, however, of this gentleman, and perhaps the description was partly poetical. We infer the possibility of this because Mr. Greenwood admits as much in regard to the dwarf Brummy, whom he describes so vividly. In his letters the dwarf is described with an accuracy which should set any detective on his traces. He has a "head with the nose almost flat to the face, and squinting eyes and an enormously wide mouth." He is afterwards described as "a man of at least middle age, judging from his grizzled grey hair and the enormous size of his head and ears" (Mr. Greenwood seems to think that men's heads and ears grow with their age), "but certainly not more than four feet and a half in height, yet with tremendous hands and feet and bandy legs." Mr. Greenwood explains that he "slightly elaborated" in this description, and now quietly allows him a possible six inches more in height. He further explains that he never said or thought that Brummy was "a resident in the place"; though, in the first letter, the dwarf looks familiarly in at the public-house and is recognized by the bulldog. He must plainly have been a temporary resident; and it is rather odd that so conspicuous a figure should not have been remarked. We should also like to know whether "Brummy" is a fictitious name or that by which the dwarf—we call him so without prejudice to the doubt about his height—actually passed. However this may be, Mr. Colam has to tell us that no clue can be found, that the forty local policemen have searched in vain, that the reward offered by the Corporation has produced no result, and that, unless the Home Secretary will divulge the sources of his information, no hope remains of a discovery. And thus, for the present, we must be content with a very lame and impotent conclusion.

It would be affectation to ignore the fact that some people will infer that the whole story was marked by something more than a "slight elaboration," and that the dwarf and the dog belong to the same category as the *Daily Telegraph's* other famous curiosity, the "old savage." Mr. Greenwood, however, positively asserts its truth, and it is possible that the narrative has been "elaborated" from some element of fact. We have admitted that there is no antecedent improbability in the story; and the only wonder which remains, and which is not without parallel, is that, assuming his accuracy, we must suppose that the roughs of Hanley are capable of keeping a secret exceedingly well. But we have still a remark to make upon Mr. Greenwood's conduct. If, instead of writing graphic letters to the *Daily Telegraph*, he had taken pains to identify the place; if, especially, he had noticed the house to which he went by day and the man with whom he carried on a long conversation; if he had then given information to the Hanley authorities, they would surely have been able next day to discover a sufficient clue to the evil-doers. True, Mr. Greenwood would then have appeared at once in the rather unpleasant character of spy, and yet as his object was, as he tells us, the suppression of such performances, it is plain that that was his true character, and he need not have shrunk from acting it effectually. He wishes, however, to be a spy without the inconveniences of the position, and to retain only the glory of a graphic exposé of social evils in the interests of morality. It is not wonderful that between these two stools he comes to the ground. He fails as an amateur detective because, when he has got his information, he keeps back the necessary details as long as possible from the officials who could act upon them. His letter only gratifies a morbid curiosity without tending to any really serviceable exposure. And thus he affords another illustration of the fact that popular writing of this kind, though it enables its author to take a high moral tone, is not necessarily conducive to the suppression of the evils assailed. It should also be observed that the sort of "elaboration" to which Mr. Greenwood confesses is only one of the natural results of the modern practice into which some of our newspapers have unfortunately fallen of discarding plain, honest, straightforward news for graphic articles

composed by Special Correspondents whose only object is to make a sensation. The conductors of these journals are apparently indifferent to the degree of truth which is contained in the thrilling narratives which they publish, as long as they are sufficiently highly-coloured and exciting. It is scarcely necessary to point out what must sooner or later be the effect of the constant practice of this art upon those who are engaged in it.

#### TWO MORE DAYS ON THE BERKSHIRE DOWNS.

WE spoke about a year ago\* of that most interesting district, the downs of Berkshire, and the part which they play in some of the most stirring scenes of our early history. The main points which, following the careful local researches of Mr. James Parker, we tried to set forth were that the site of Alfred's victory on *Æscesdūn* had been wholly mistaken—that *Æscesdūn* is the name, not of any particular place, the modern Ashdown Park or any other, but of the whole range of hills—that the actual scene of the battle was not near the White Horse and Uffington Castle, but a good way to the east, on the part of the hills lying nearer to Wallingford and to Reading. This, we think, will be the view taken by any one who carefully compares the site with the contemporary authorities, without troubling himself with what are called traditions, that is the guesses of a century or two back. A further ramble on the downs, and a minutest examination of what was most likely the actual field of battle, have made us feel still more certain about the matter. The whole range has the great advantage that it is easy of access from several points on the Great Western Railway. That it should be approached from Wantage Road seems fitting enough; it may seem more surprising that the best way of getting to the scene of Alfred's victory should be from so unromantic a station as Didcot. Of course any one who wishes to go over the ground of all the battles should begin, as the actual combatants did, at Reading. But for the site of the third battle, the battle fought on *Æscesdūn* itself, Didcot forms a good starting-point. Those who do not care to walk the whole way may do well to drive as far as Blewbury, through Hagbourne, where the church will be found worth looking at, and thence to begin making their way up "Mons fraxini."

It will be remembered that the campaign began with the English victory at Englefield—a name which in itself suggests the memory of earlier victories in days when Englishmen were the invaders and not the invaded—a victory which was followed by the second fight at Reading itself, in which the Danes had the victory and Ealdorman *Æthelwulf* was killed. The object of the Danes then naturally was to get possession of the range of *Æscesdūn*, and thereby to command the whole country for many miles on both sides. The Chronicle merely records that the fight happened four days after the death of *Æthelwulf*, and was fought on "*Æscesdūne*." The minutest description of the site comes from Asser, who also amplifies the narrative which the Chronicle gives of the battle. He was not an eye-witness, but it is almost more pleasing to find that his interest in the exploits of his master and friend had led him to visit the spot. After mentioning the solitary thorn-tree, he adds, "*quam nos ipsi nostris propriis oculis vidimus*." It seems clear from Asser's account that the victorious Danes set out first on their march up the hill, and that the English under *Æthelred* and Alfred followed them. He does not say so in so many words, but his narrative takes it for granted. And at the eastern end of the hill there is a kind of fork affording two ways by which the hill might be climbed. He distinctly mentions that the Danes held the higher ground and the English the lower, which would almost of itself imply that the Danes had the start in the march. And the use of the word *præoccupaverant* shows that in any case they had the start in the actual battle, and were able to get possession of the more advantageous ground. This ground can hardly fail to have been the high point of the hill called Lowbury, where the faint traces of a square camp may be made out. Those works however must not be attributed to the Danes, though they may very well have made use of them. The form and the abundance of oyster shells to be found there make it pretty clear that these entrenchments are of Roman work. Just below this point, on ground which must be crossed in marching to Lowbury up the north-eastern fork of the hill, lies a piece of ground which exactly answers to the phrase of Asser, "*campestris Æscesdūn latitudo*," a wide piece of level ground on the top of the hill. This, it can hardly be doubted, was the scene of the actual fighting, and, if so, the place where *Æthelred's* tent was pitched cannot be very far from the point now known as the King's Standing-ground, though it is far more likely that the name is due to some much more modern King. Here, it will be remembered, the pious King insisted on hearing the full service of the mass to the end before he came to the help of his brother Alfred, who was already engaged with the heathen Earls, against whose division of the army he was to lead his own, while the West-Saxon King was to lead his against the Danish Kings. The site can hardly be mistaken; the fight was on *Æscesdūn*; the words of the Chronicle, in the later passage under 1006, when the Danes marched along *Æscesdūn* to *Owicheleshlæw*, show that *Æscesdūn* was the name of the hill itself, and here, on the hill itself, on the part of the hill which would naturally be first reached by the troops marching from Reading, we find a spot which exactly answers the description of a contemporary historian

\* *Saturday Review*, July 26, 1873.



who had heard the account of the battle from those who had been in it, and had himself afterwards gone to examine the ground. For the particular solitary thorn-tree of which Asser speaks we should of course now look in vain. But such solitary thorn-trees still form a marked feature in the scenery of the hill, and so help to confirm the accuracy of Asser's observations. In this battle, which comes as a gleam between dark times of defeat, both before and after, the Danes were utterly defeated, their flying troops were scattered and chased over and down the hill, the English following them as far as their "arx" or citadel, by which nothing can be meant except their fortified post at Reading from which they had set out. In the two contemporary narratives, the shorter one in the Chronicle and the longer one in Asser, there is nothing to tempt any one to connect the scene of the battle with the White Horse and with Uffington Castle; there is everything to connect it with Lowbury. Of the later writers, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon do little more than translate the Chronicle. Florence copies Asser at length. This is a little disappointing, as there are phrases in Asser's account which almost sound as if they were translations of a contemporary English ballad; and as Henry of Huntingdon so largely used materials of that kind at points of his history both earlier and later than this, we might have hoped to find some more fragments of the old English song imbedded in his Latin, just as we find in his accounts of Anderida on the one hand and of Stamford bridge on the other. He does however keep the true name of the hill, *Æscsedūn*, which William of Malmesbury has corrupted into *Æscendun*. There was of course a natural tendency to confound this name with *Assandun* in Essex, the place of the last great fight between Cnut and Eadmund Ironsides. Florence gives the proper translation of the name of the East-Saxon hill, the humble "Mons asini." But, just as William of Malmesbury has here turned *Æscsedūn* into *Æscendun*, so, when they get to *Assandun*, Henry of Huntingdon turns it into *Eesdun*, while the *Encomiast* of the Lady Emma places the fight in "*Æsceneduno loco, quod nos Latini montem fraxinorum possumus interpretari.*" There too, just as in Berkshire, the site of the battle has been by some modern writers moved from its real place at the modern Ashington to another Ashdown in that county.

The whole region on which the eye looks down from these hills is full of interest. A prominent object in the view from the eastern part of the range is the long nave and massive tower of the church of Cholesey, one of the places ravaged by the Danes just before their hill march in 1006. The present building, a thorough minster in its character, though a minster of the very smallest type, a worthy fellow to Leonard Stanley and Llanbadarn, was doubtless built when the church was given by Henry the First, along with the distant Leominster, as a cell to his newly founded abbey of Reading. It is then spoken of as a ruined monastery, "*dirutum monasterium,*" having most likely stood so since the time of the Danish inroad. At no great distance lies the more famous place which the Danes ravaged the day before their visit to Cholesey, the frontier town and fortress of Wallingford. The name, coupled with its neighbour Englefield, points to the progress of the first English conquerors in this region. There were already English settlements on the northern side of the hill, while the Welsh still kept possession of the most important passage of the Thames. The entrenchments at Wallingford have much in common with their doomed neighbours at Dorchester, fast vanishing, but still not wholly vanished, beneath the hand of the merciless destroyer and of the Parliament which refuses to step in and stay his hand. The earthworks at Wallingford fence in three sides of a rectangular space, of which the fourth side is formed by the river. As to the origin of the works at Dorchester no man can doubt. They are the original *castra* from which the Roman invader, perhaps Aulus Plautius himself, besieged the British entrenchment on the opposite hill. But Wallingford is not, like its neighbour, a Roman *chester*; it bears no Roman name; it has no Roman remains or traditions of any kind; yet any one would at first sight set down this rectangular intrenchment as a Roman work. It is the suggestion of one of the first living authorities on these matters that this work, at once Roman and not Roman, is really, like the legionary eagle at Silchester, a Roman work wrought after the Romans were gone, a work raised by Britons who had not forgotten the military lessons of their masters as a defence against the English invader. Such an origin of the earthworks perfectly falls in with the name of the place. The "ford of the sons of the Welsh" was doubtless a great point of English attack, and its conquest was one of the greatest achievements of the early days of West-Saxon victory. Close within the intrenchment stands the great mound, doubtless, like its neighbour at Oxford, one of the works of the tenth century, the works of Eadward the Unconquered and his mighty sister. There, we may believe, dwelt Wiggod, who, by whatever means—one may suspect by treason to his country—won the favour of the Norman Conqueror, and kept and increased the great estates which, after his son had died on foreign ground fighting for the foreign King against his rebellious son, passed to the foreign husbands of his daughters. Certain it is that, as Wallingford was the point whence in 1006 the Dane crossed from Mercian into West-Saxon ground, it was the point where sixty years later the Norman passed from West-Saxon into Mercian ground. In short, the whole of this region, the valley of the great frontier stream of Southern England, is one of the most historic districts of our island. On these hills and at their foot we are treading on the remains of all the various contending races which have made the banks of the Thames their battle-

ground. Dorchester marks the strife of the Roman with the Briton; Wallingford marks the strife of the Briton with the Englishman, of the Englishman first with the Dane and then with the Norman. The neighbouring Bensington preserves the records of a less famous strife, but a strife of no small importance in early English history, the process by which the Saxons were driven from the conquests beyond the Thames by the Angles pressing from the north, the process by which the great river was fixed as the boundary between the two great divisions of the Teutonic conquerors of Britain, a change which had no doubt the effect of driving the West-Saxon arms to the further west, and hindered the survival of such a separate British land to the west of Wessex as still remains to the west of Mercia. The conquests of the Mercian on the Thames decided the fate of distant Cornwall. The race who were beaten back by their Teutonic kinsfolk from Bensington and the Oxfordshire Somerton found their recompense in the process by one stage of which the Briton was driven from Exeter, and by another all Cornwall was, as it appears in Domesday, mapped out among English owners.

The Berkshire Downs then and the lands which lie at their feet are thus among those parts of England on which the successive stages of our early history have been most clearly written. It is well that their minute examination has fallen into the hands of a local inquirer who knows what evidence is, and who is not led away from the clear witness of charters and chronicles by such a will-o'-the-wisp as those modern guesses which so unfairly take to themselves the venerable name of tradition.

#### "BLOODY GARDINER."

IF there is any truth in the proverb, "Throw plenty of mud, and some will stick," it no doubt applies especially to cases where the *odium theologicum* comes in to clench the charge. There are no lies that die so hard as lies that have a controversial importance. The whole history of "the B. Reformation," from whatever side it is told, is a conspicuous illustration of this; but it is only with the English Reformation, and with one distinguished personage whose name is mixed up in the contest, that we are immediately concerned here. Everybody of course is familiar with the name of "Bonner, whom all generations shall call bloody," or, as Foxe with questionable wit delights to call him, "that bloody bitesheep." But it was something new to us to find the "fixed epithet" which Fuller and Foxe have succeeded in attaching to Bonner, like Homer's "rosy-fingered morn," quietly extended, with hardly a word of explanation or evidence, to Gardiner. We had occasion the other day to comment on some of the startling historical revelations propounded in Sir William Harcourt's speech on the Public Worship Bill, and there is a good deal in a letter of his since published in the *Times* which might tempt us to resume our criticism. It would be interesting for instance to learn how a Communion which remains "spiritually" the same can yet be "ecclesiastically" different, or how the "image of the national will" was stamped on a liturgy which its authors never ventured generally to enforce. But we forbear. Our readers have probably heard enough of Sir William's legal and historical paradoxes for the present. When however he proceeds by a side wind to sweep "the black and bloody Gardiner" out of his path, he is but rehearsing in more explicit terms a kind of rhetoric which is common enough among ordinary sciolists, but which sounds rather strangely in the mouth of a man of assumed learning and high position some thirty years after the appearance of Dr. Maitland's *Essays on the Reformation*. There may be some *prima facie* ground—though it is really nothing more—for speaking of "the bloody Bonner"; but there is not even any plausible pretext for affixing such an epithet to Gardiner. That he has been denounced by historians like Hume, and in our days by Mr. Froude, as a persecutor is true enough; with what amount of reason will appear presently. But to justify such a description as "black and bloody" something more is required than to show that a high official took part in the legal punishment of heretics in an age when the very notion of toleration was scouted by all sides alike, certainly not least by the Protestant leaders. That there are persecutors of the sixteenth century fairly open to the charge of cruelty is true; no impartial student of history can doubt that neither Gardiner nor even Bonner is among them. And it is only fair to remember that Gardiner, unlike some of his contemporaries, did not seek to impose upon others a faith to which he was himself indifferent. His position was rather a peculiar one, and Mr. Froude, who has a keen eye for theological distinctions, is not altogether wrong in calling him the "inventor of Anglicanism." He was firmly attached to those Catholic doctrines which continued to form part of the established religion to the close of Henry's reign, both before and after the breach with Rome, and he suffered imprisonment throughout the reign of his successor rather than abandon them. But while he consistently adhered from first to last to the whole cycle of beliefs which it is the modern fashion to stigmatize under the name of "sacerdotalism"—and that may perhaps help to explain Sir W. Harcourt's peculiar bitterness against him—he cannot without a great abuse of terms be called a Romanizer or Romanist. The Papal Supremacy he regarded at best as a matter of indifference, though he may have thought, after six years' experience of Edward's Protestant policy, that it was the smaller of two evils. But this was seldom or never the critical question in the

Marian persecutions. Of the three hundred or so of victims—the precise number we believe is 277—put to death for heresy during her reign, scarcely any suffered for rejecting the Pope's supremacy. Their trial almost always turned on the denial of doctrines about which neither Bonner nor Gardiner had ever wavered—most often on the Real Presence. There is no evidence whatever that either of these prelates was harsh or bloodthirsty in enforcing the law on that matter, and there is much evidence to the contrary; and this is especially true of Gardiner.

Let us first take the testimony of an impartial historian of the last generation, whose sympathies are strongly Protestant, and who had not the means which now exist of correcting popular misconceptions of history. To the common assumption, repeated by Sir W. Harcourt—on which we shall have a word to say presently—that Gardiner had a hand in the "Six Bloody Articles," or was their main author, Sir James Mackintosh does not even allude. He does indeed assert that Gardiner was "at least in the beginning" a chief author of the Marian persecutions, but only on the wholly inadequate ground that his great abilities, commanding character, and high station do not allow us to doubt it; but he adds that the Chancellor probably did not intend the persecution to extend beyond the Protestant ringleaders, and that, when disappointed by their resistance, he withdrew from a share in vain bloodshed. That Gardiner did his best to confine the executions for heresy within these limits is perfectly true, and we may gather even from Foxe's one-sided narrative a similar inference as to Bonner. If there was to be persecution at all—and that neither of them could have prevented, had he desired it—this was obviously the wisest as well as the most merciful policy. Sir James Mackintosh goes on to say that many of the prelates are recorded by Protestant writers to have exercised an effectual and perhaps hazardous humanity, and that their violent language was often a cloak for more effectually screening the accused. He observes that of fourteen dioceses they altogether prevented bloodshed in nine, and reduced it within limits in the remaining five; "justice to Gardiner requires it to be mentioned that his diocese was of the bloodless class." And although he quotes with approval Fuller's libellous description of Bonner—Dr. Maitland had not then exposed its absurdity—he feels bound to point out that Fuller's charge against the Bishop of London of burning about one-half the martyrs in the kingdom really proves nothing, inasmuch as they were sent to the capital from all parts of England for the purpose. We may add that many of Foxe's most ill-natured stories, when they come to be sifted, prove just as little, even assuming their accuracy to be beyond dispute, and that is not often the case. Thus, for instance, the well-known story—illustrated by a large woodcut in the old editions of Foxe's martyrology—of Bonner's holding the hand of Thomas Tomkins, the weaver, over a lighted taper "to try his constancy," after exhausting all his powers of persuasion to induce him to recant, simply proves, if true, his persistent desire to save the prisoner from a punishment which it was not within his discretion to remit. As Maitland justly remarks, "Whether it was wisely done, people may dispute; but that it was kindly meant no person of common sense can doubt." And it is worth noting that, in all similar tales about Bonner's cruelty, he is never alleged to have done these things in order to extort confession of guilt or names of accomplices by torture, but always with a view of inducing convicted heretics to adopt the only available means of saving themselves from further punishment. And he often, on Foxe's own showing, kept them in confinement for weeks or months, notwithstanding their refusal to listen to his persuasions, in the hope of their eventual submission. This hardly corresponds with the language of Foxe's elegant couplet:—

This cannibal, in three years' space, three hundred martyrs slew,  
They were his food; he loved so blood; he spared none he knew.

But we have no time to follow Foxe through the details of his nauseous indictment, and must refer our readers to Maitland's *Essays* for a minute exposure of his wholesale mendacity.

If we turn back from Mackintosh to Hume, we shall find him taking the ordinary Protestant view of Gardiner's character, and implicitly crediting him with the Act of the Six Articles, but without alleging any evidence whatever for this charge, or for saddling him with the graver responsibility of the Marian persecutions, while he mentions one fact which looks entirely the other way. After Mary's accession, Peter Martyr, anticipating a persecution, was anxious to leave the country, but some zealous Catholics moved for his commitment to prison. Gardiner not only opposed this, urging that he had come over by invitation of the Government, but supplied him with the means for his journey home. Mr. Froude, as might be expected, is both more explicit and much more bitter than Hume. His way of dealing with the case is highly characteristic. He tells us in his third volume that the cruel nature of the Act of Six Articles was attributed "by sound authority" to the influence of Gardiner, but the only authority he gives, besides Foxe's—which he admits not to be worth much—is a phrase in a letter of Melancthon's "Oh cursed bishops! oh wicked Winchester!" which is certainly worth no more. When however he comes in the sixth volume to sum up Gardiner's character on his death, the indictment opens with "He passed the Six Articles Bill," as though it were one of the most notorious facts of history, instead of resting at best on mere conjecture. His other allegations of cruelty against Gardiner are based on much the same kind of evidence. Of his high abilities and services to the State Mr. Froude of course

feels constrained to speak with respect. Lingard may perhaps be put aside as a prejudiced witness, yet his history is generally colourless enough, and he had no particular reason for admiring a prelate who, if in one sense an orthodox Catholic, was a very unsatisfactory Papist. He mentions Gardiner's being on the Committee named for drawing up the Act of Six Articles—as was also Cranmer—but mentions further that, as there is extant a Bill nearly similar in Henry's own handwriting, there is good reason for believing the King himself to be its real author. And he emphatically denies that there is any authentic document to support the charge made against Gardiner by Reformed writers of being responsible for the Marian persecutions, while the whole tenor of his conduct contradicts it.

As regards the Six Articles Act, however, there is a word more to be said. Lingard naturally enough calls it "a severe and barbarous statute," and so it was, judged by any modern standard of toleration. But the Act was framed in a severe and barbarous age, and the offences against which it was in fact mainly directed were of a nature that would not be tolerated in any civilized society. Subsequent events show that it was intended to frighten people rather than to hurt them, and was never meant to be executed according to the letter. It caused several of the more violent partisans of the Reformation to quit the country, and made those who stayed at home more quiet and peaceable. At the outside, according to Foxe's list, which is not likely to be defective, only twenty-eight persons suffered death under the Act during the eight years it continued in force. But the sort of "ribalds" against whom it was chiefly put in use were for the time effectually suppressed. It may sound strange to our ears to hear of persons being arraigned and punished for "reading the Bible in Paul's" or "depraving the sacrament"; but when we find that the first charge meant collecting a multitude of people and making a tumult in the Cathedral, while the second includes such practices as maintaining boys to sing songs against the sacrament of the altar in public and interrupting the solemnities of divine service with studied mockery of what was still, be it remembered, the religious belief of the immense majority of the nation, we can hardly wonder that the Government should have thought it time to interfere. Nor is there any proof that the Bishops carried out the Act in a violent manner, but the reverse. On one occasion, for instance, when two hundred persons had been presented to Gardiner for tumultuous proceedings of this kind, he was "content that one should be bound for another," and on this easy bail they were all discharged. There is however, we repeat, no reason to believe that Gardiner had any hand in originating the Act, and of the first four persons condemned to death under its provisions one was begged off by him. And his dealings with those brought before his Court as Lord Chancellor for sedition or heresy in Mary's reign were quite of a piece with this conduct, although, like Lawrence Saunders, who "gave a privy nip to Winchester," as Foxe expresses it, they often publicly insulted him to his face. It would be easy of course, if space permitted, to go more fully into detail, but we have perhaps said enough to show what sort of reliance can be placed on writers like Fuller, Foxe, and even Strype, who describe the bishops of the Marian period generally as a whole forest of wild beasts raging among a flock of defenceless sheep, and Bonner in particular as an ogre whose fury no sex, quality, or age could escape. If their language about "wily Winchester," who is now held up to odium as "black and bloody Gardiner," is a trifle less grotesquely virulent, it is still not one whit more consonant with facts.

#### LIFE ASSURANCE.

IN a disagreeable sense "novation" has become a household word in England. The same question, with every variety of circumstance, has been presented to the Judges of the Court of Chancery, and to the arbitrators appointed to wind up the Albert and European Assurance Companies. The question arose out of those amalgamations of Companies which were so frequent in the last twenty years. In a recent case there had been three successive amalgamations of Companies whose names we must take the liberty of shortening. The Householders' transferred its business to the English and Irish Church, and that to the British Nation, and that again to the European. There is probably more to be got from the Householders' than from the European, and therefore a policy-holder naturally endeavours to make out that he never relinquished the liability of the Company in which he originally insured. But Lord Romilly held that there had been "novation," and consequently that no claim could be made against the Householders'. A learned Judge once said that, if he had not had considerable experience, he should have thought that the case before him was not arguable, and perhaps that remark might have been made in the case before us. But there have been many decisions under different circumstances against "novation," and when the question is between saving a little out of the wreck and saving nothing, it is not wonderful that policy-holders should speculate on the uncertainty of the law. In an early case an Indian officer bought an annuity in the Family Endowment Society, which was afterwards absorbed into the Albert. He received his annuity under his grant from the Family before the amalgamation, and afterwards from the Albert, and he gave receipts in the name of the Albert until that Company stopped payment, but his



grant was never exchanged for a grant from the Albert. It was held that he had not accepted the Albert as his debtor in place of the Family. In another early case there had been an insurance in the Times Company, which afterwards made over its business to the Albert. At the time of this transaction circulars were sent to the assured, informing him that the Albert would be responsible on the policy, and requesting him to pay future premiums to the Albert, and to send his policy to the Albert to be endorsed. He never sent his policy to be endorsed, but he paid his premiums to the Albert and accepted a bonus. The Albert having become insolvent shortly after the death of the assured, his representative claimed to be a creditor of the Times. But it was held that the assured had accepted the Albert as his debtor in place of the Times. Other cases followed in quick succession, and the ingenuity of commentators was exercised to reconcile all the decisions of different judges, or even of the same judge, with one another. Then the Albert Company was handed over to Lord Cairns as arbitrator, and afterwards the European Company was committed to Lord Westbury. Attempts to fix liability upon the shareholders of absorbed Companies succeeded to a considerable extent, so that in effect Companies supposed to be defunct were found to be still existing for the purpose of entailing loss, although not for yielding profit. Policyholders and annuitants suffered ruin, which was but slightly mitigated by inflicting ruin upon shareholders. In India and Australia, in every colony and possession of England, as well as in England itself, these names "Albert" and "European" were of fearful import. Business which might be safe and profitable had been conducted recklessly or dishonestly, and at length the state of things became so intolerable that a remedy was attempted by Parliament. By an Act of 1870 returns were required from Life Assurance Companies which would supply considerable means of judging of the security afforded by them. Some persons would be able to form opinions for themselves, and others would be guided by them, until gradually a clear distinction would come to be drawn between safe and unsafe Companies. It is difficult to explain on what principle intending assurers proceeded in selecting a Company before this Act was passed. Agents were stimulated by liberal commissions to press new Companies in every way, and perhaps the real reason for the selection of a particular Company was often no more than this, that the agent was an agreeable man. The most recent Companies assumed grand and sonorous names, and when several Companies were amalgamated, a combination of names was made so as to produce one name too long to be either spoken or remembered. Many people did and do make their choice simply by following the lead of some friend in whose prudence they had faith, and perhaps it is better to do this than to puzzle over figures. There are several offices mainly supported by the clergy, and others of which the trustees and directors are selected from the best known men in both branches of the profession of the law. If two or three ex-Chancellors and Judges, with a dozen Queen's Counsel and leading solicitors, cannot keep an Assurance Company straight, the business of such Companies must have a strange capacity for entanglement. The wonder is that, when it is so easy to go right, many Companies have gone wrong. It has been said that the competition in business has caused it to be undertaken on disadvantageous terms; but in one sense competition, canvassing, or, call it, if you will, touting, is meritorious. The principle of life assurance cannot be too widely advocated, and perhaps some remedy might be found for the thoughtless, self-indulgent habits of the wage-receiving class by urging on them the duty of providing by life assurance for their wives and children. Perhaps it would be more effectual to urge the wife to make this provision herself by the application of weekly savings.

It is of course desirable to insure on the most advantageous terms, but it is more desirable to insure beyond the possibility of doubt. Husbands and fathers are chiefly anxious upon this point, and how are they to feel certain on it? They can only do this by ascertaining what funds the office has in hand, how these funds are invested, and what relation these funds bear to the liabilities of the Company. The returns made under the Act of 1870 supply this information, and we are thus enabled to apply a test to all Companies, and we should either avoid altogether those which do not satisfactorily answer it, or at any rate only resort to them under particular reasons for confidence in the management. Everything must have a beginning, and we cannot expect a new Company to possess the accumulated capital of a Company that has done a large and steady business for forty years. But persons without special knowledge or connexions will do well to select some Company that satisfies the following test. Experience shows that the premiums received annually may be reckoned at three per cent. on the sums assured. Thus, if an office has outstanding policies for a million sterling, its income from premiums will be 30,000*l.* a year. If it raises 30,000*l.* a year, its outstanding policies will be for a million. Supposing that an office has outstanding policies to this amount, what amount of assets, invested in indisputable securities, should it have? The answer derived from the history and position of the best offices is that the accumulated fund of the Society should be at least eight times the amount of the annual premiums, or should be at least one-fourth of the money assured. The position of the best offices would be more truly described by saying that their accumulated fund is ten times the amount of their premium revenue, or one-third of the sum assured, and there are offices which have a fund twenty times the amount of their premium revenue. But

the insurer need not apply a rule which only a few offices could satisfy, and the rule which would bid him be content with eight times the annual premiums is, we believe, quite safe.

The returns which supply these particulars have been lately published in rather a bulky blue-book, of which the principal portion has been reprinted and published at less than half the price of the official volume. This publication (Murby, Bouverie Street), or any similar one, will enable persons intending to insure to apply the test above proposed for themselves. The securities in which the accumulated fund is invested are specifically stated. Thus it is said that so much is invested on mortgage of land, so much in railway debentures and debenture stock, so much in East Indian or Colonial Government securities, and so on. It would be invidious to mention names, but we will take the page at which the book opens, and we find that the premiums amount to rather less than 170,000*l.*, and the accumulated fund is just over 2,000,000*l.* This fund is stated to be invested as follows:—Mortgages on freehold estates, 1,100,000*l.*; British Government securities, 37,000*l.*; Railway debentures and debenture stock, 70,000*l.*; Gaslight and Coke Companies mortgage bonds, 112,000*l.*; on security of parochial and other rates under Act of Parliament, 433,000*l.*, and so on. This office has been established forty-five years. Besides these annual returns, the Act requires every Company once in either five or ten years to cause an investigation to be made into its financial condition by an actuary, and to cause an abstract of that actuary's report to be made and returned for publication. This investigation would of course involve a valuation of the securities in which the accumulated fund is invested. As regards many of the items, if we are told their exact nature, we can value them for ourselves. But in general we find only, for example, "railway debentures," without specifying of what Companies. Most of the large Companies have at least 1,000,000*l.* invested on mortgage, and if a Board of Directors were dishonest, it might be difficult to prevent their lending on so-called securities which are practically worthless. But the investigation which must come within ten years ought, if thoroughly made, to expose such fraud. A mortgage ought of course to be accompanied by a valuation of the property comprised in it, and it would be difficult and dangerous to fabricate documents of that character. In the interest of the assured we might desire the Act to be more stringent, but any proposal of that nature would probably be resisted by the Companies. Happily the competition for business induces the publication of even fuller details than are required by the Act, and even if there be still some room for doubt, there is at least no reason for incurring the terrible risks which are exemplified in the history of the Albert and European and their associated Companies. As long as these cases as to "novation" crop up in the law reports, the remembrance of past folly and blindness will be preserved for future warning. Let us hope that that warning will be effectual. The publicity now enforced, if it be helped by public intelligence, ought to kill unsound offices before they are able to do any great mischief.

#### RATIONAL LAW-MAKING.

AMONG the recommendations contained in the recently published Report of the Select Committee on Public Departments is one to the effect that the Statutes of the Realm should in future be printed in a form which will admit of the volume comprising the year's legislation being sold at about five shillings. The Committee thinks that the issue of Acts of Parliament in a cheap form is a matter of great public importance, since it would furnish to all classes an opportunity of informing themselves upon the laws which they are expected to obey. As the recommendation stands, the discrepancy between the end proposed and the means suggested for its attainment is very considerable. The publication of the statutes at the rate of five shillings a volume might be valuable as an indication of the disposition of the Government to make its subjects acquainted with the laws under which they live, but this is about all that can be said in its favour. Very few persons would care to pick out the provisions which specially affect them from the ponderous volume which contains the annual results of Parliamentary wisdom. The mere table of contents would throw most unlearned readers into hopeless confusion; and if any person more persevering than the rest succeeded in getting hold of the statute he was in search of, he would eventually be confounded by the technical language and the frequent references to other Acts not contained in the same volume. It may be questioned whether the authors of this recommendation are themselves in the habit of studying the laws which they assist in passing. At the same time the object which the Committee has in view is one of real importance. In England punishment is in too many cases the principal machinery for diffusing a knowledge of law. Certain acts are forbidden, and certain acts are enjoined, but a great part of the community only discovers what these acts severally are by suffering, or seeing others suffer, for doing or not doing them. The criminal class, indeed, learns to distinguish between the offences which involve penal servitude and those which are let off with imprisonment; but there is a much larger class which lives in almost total ignorance of the laws which are supposed to govern its conduct, and by consequence furnishes many unintentional recruits to the criminal class. There must be a considerable number of offences which would

never have been committed if the offender had clearly taken in beforehand that he was bringing himself within the grasp of the law. If even a few persons can be kept from breaking the law by being made more familiar with its provisions, it will clearly be a cheaper process than giving them an experimental acquaintance with the penalties which they incur by their ignorance. Besides this, a better knowledge of what the law commands or forbids might sometimes save people from making blunders which, as regards results, may be not less disastrous than actual crimes. There is a good deal of ignorant wrong-dealing—with trust property for example—which is not fraudulent, but yet produces as much misery as though it were fraudulent. If the principles of the laws affecting trustees were better known most of this might be avoided, and they would be better known if the laws themselves could be had in a cheaper and more intelligible shape. Trustees would then contract a habit of looking at the law before dealing with the funds under their care, and the existence of greater facilities for gaining a knowledge of a trustee's duties might induce many cautious men to accept the office who are now deterred by the sense of their own ignorance and of the risks which that ignorance involves. A further gain would be found in the removal of one cause of the impunity which offenders against the law too often enjoy. Those who are injured by breaches of the law do not know what means of redress have been provided for them, and they consequently sit down patiently under wrongs for which they would otherwise seek compensation. It would be rash to say that the diffusion of this knowledge would always benefit its possessor, inasmuch as even a successful suit is usually a costly gratification. But it would benefit the community at large, since it would make many wrongdoers hesitate before incurring penalties which they now disregard because they feel assured that the law will not be put in force against them. What is really wanted for this purpose is cheap and convenient editions of separate Acts or groups of Acts, especially of those which affect the less educated classes. Some acquaintance with law is desirable for every one, but it is most of all desirable for those who from various circumstances are least likely to possess it if it is not designedly brought within their reach. Something more would be needed, however, than the bare text of the Act of Parliament. Such editions as we have in view should be accompanied with a plain and untechnical statement of what the Act purports to do. The best drawn statute needs to be supplemented in this way before it can be adapted for popular use. It would be further desirable that to each Act, or group of Acts, there should be prefixed a concise explanation of a few elementary legal conceptions. It ought not to be impossible to give reasons why laws ought to be obeyed, or why contracts should be enforced, which would secure a more intelligent acquiescence than can be extorted by that vague dread of the police or of a "lawyer's letter" which at present constitutes to a large part of the population the sole sanction in civil and criminal matters. If these editions were thoroughly well prepared and were published at a sufficiently low price, contemporary statute law would not remain the sealed book which it is to the vast majority of Englishmen.

A more remote advantage following upon the adoption of this plan would be seen in the preparation of the Acts thus popularized. In proportion as it became recognized that laws are meant to be understood, and understood by those to whom they are addressed, as well as by the experts who expound them, Parliament would be forced to give up passing laws which are unintelligible. The mystery and confusion of many Acts are due not so much to the inherent difficulty of the subject matter, as to the carelessness of those who make them. It is a constant complaint of the judges who have to interpret Acts of Parliament that they have been passed in a shape which will not allow of any uniform and consistent sense being put upon all parts of them. The judge has to pick out what seems to be the meaning of the principal provisions and to neglect, or put a gloss upon, other provisions which conflict with this. If a statute had to be explained as soon as passed, it would be necessary to create a competent legal staff for this express purpose, and, after this staff had reported several times that such and such a new Act was so obscurely worded that, until the opinion of the judges could be taken upon it, it would have to be issued without the customary explanation, it would probably be found convenient to consult the legal department as to the effect of a Bill before it had been read a third time. By this means amendments in Committee would come to bear their true character—that of instructions to the draftsmen as to the purpose of the modifications to be introduced into the original Bill. At present, however intelligible a Bill may be when it is first introduced, there is no security that it will not become utter nonsense by the time that it has got through Committee. A number of contradictory amendments are proposed, some of which are adopted in part, others altogether, some in the form in which they are first conceived, others after they have been amended in their turn. It is nobody's business to see that these changes are properly dovetailed into the Bill, still less that they harmonize with the unamended parts of it, or with one another. It is quite possible that every clause of a large measure may have been altered during its passage through Committee, and that, in order to make it attain what has now become its object, the whole structure of the Bill ought to be recast. The existence of a Parliamentary legal department would make this process comparatively simple. Instead of members undertaking to alter the wording of each separate clause, they would propose their

amendments upon each section, and the original words, together with the change ordered to be introduced instead of them, would go back to the legal department to be put into proper form.

By slightly extending the functions of this department the time of the House of Commons might be very much economized. At present nothing is known of the contents of a Bill upon its first introduction except what can be gathered from the statement of the member who asks leave to bring it in; and when, as not unfrequently happens, leave is given without anything more than the title of the Bill being read, there is no opportunity of explaining its provisions until the debate on the second reading. If every Bill were printed before leave was asked to bring it in, and further, if every Bill were prefaced by a statement of the objects which it proposed to effect, and the means by which this object was to be attained, members would know beforehand whether these objects were such as they desired to see achieved, and whether the means proposed seemed calculated to achieve them. If the majority of the House were satisfied that the objects set forth in the Bill were inexpedient, the discussion would naturally be taken on the motion for leave, and, unless the mover could change the opinion of the House upon the merits of his Bill as set out in the preliminary statement, it would be rejected at that stage instead of taking up valuable time some weeks later. In the case of Bills the objects of which were *prima facie* good such an explanation would make it easier to distinguish between means and ends, and thus tend to check that confusion between what ought to be said in the debate on the Second Reading and what ought to be reserved for the discussion in Committee. In the case of Bills which became law, the preliminary statement modified by the changes introduced during the progress of the measure would supply the foundation of the explanation to be prefixed to the Act of Parliament. Under the present system, Bills the drift of which is but imperfectly understood are allowed to pass into laws the meaning of which is necessarily obscure. Under such a system as has just been sketched, the meaning of the original Bill, of the amendments on it, and of the Act growing out of them, would be alike intelligible.

#### PROSECUTION OF THE JOCKEY CLUB.

IT is difficult to argue satisfactorily against the liability of the Jockey Club to the prosecution which has been commenced against it. Common knowledge will supply a sufficient description of the betting-ring as it exists at Epsom, Ascot, Newmarket, and other racecourses, and there must necessarily be at all these places an owner or occupier who knowingly permits the ring to be used by other persons for the purpose of betting with those who resort thereto. If we want to back a horse we go to the ring and find some one to lay the odds against him, and if we are mere occasional betters we deposit our money when the bet is booked. These transactions take place on every race at every meeting, and most of the persons with whom we deal carry on a regular business, and are found in the ring of every racecourse. There is at Newmarket a public ring which may be entered by any one who buys a ticket, and an enclosure to which only members of Tattersall's are admitted. We perhaps see the horses saddled for a race, make up our minds to back one of them, and hasten to the ring to put on our money before the start. It may be conceded that the primary object of the Act was to put down the betting-houses which had been opened in London and other large towns, and it probably did not enter into the minds of the authors of the Act that it would interfere with betting on a racecourse. The betting-houses were a new thing at the time of passing the Act, whereas there had always been betting on racecourses, although not so extensive and systematic as it has now become. The Act recites that a kind of gaming has of late sprung up tending to the injury and demoralization of improvident persons by the opening of places called betting-houses or offices, and the receiving of money in advance by the owners or occupiers thereof on their promises to pay money on events of horse-races; and it is enacted that no house, office, room, or other place shall be opened, kept, or used for the purpose of the owner, occupier, or keeper thereof, or any person using the same, betting with persons resorting thereto. It may be contended that to satisfy this enactment there must be a "place" capable, as a house, office, or room would be, of exclusive occupation, and it will be found that the decided cases have, until recently, gone upon the supposed satisfaction of this requirement. Thus, in a case decided in 1868, a temporary wooden structure was placed on a strip of land outside the enclosure at Doncaster, and a person occupying this structure transacted the business of betting with all comers. This, said the Court, was clearly a place and an office opened, kept, and used for the purpose of carrying on the business of which the appellant had the management. "It is no matter whether there is a roof or none, or whether the structure is moveable or fastened to the earth; it is clearly an office within the meaning of the Act." In a case which occurred this year at Chester the defendant stood on a stool, over which was a large umbrella, fixed in the ground by a spike. On the umbrella the defendant's name was painted, and a card was affixed stating that all bets would be paid first past the post. The defendant called out offering to make bets, and he was seen to make bets, money being deposited with him for which he gave tickets. The Court held that the stool and umbrella constituted a "place" within the Act, and the conviction by the magistrates was affirmed.



Thus far the Courts seem to have recognized the principle that there must be a "place," which, like an "office," is capable of exclusive occupation. It appears probable that this is the correct principle of construction, because the next section of the Act declares that every house, room, office, or place opened, kept, or used for the purposes aforesaid, shall be deemed to be a common gaming-house, within the meaning of the Act to amend the law concerning Games and Wagers. Now a common gaming-house is a house, room, or place kept by an individual, or it may be a partnership or company, to which idle and evil-disposed persons are caused and procured to frequent and come to play at some unlawful game, such as *roulette*. The next section of the Act against Betting-houses enacts that any person who, being the owner or occupier of any house, room, office, or other place, shall knowingly and wilfully permit the same to be opened, kept, or used by any other person for the purposes aforesaid, shall be liable to a penalty of 100*l*. This is the section under which the Stewards of the Jockey Club have been prosecuted. It may be argued, however, that the owner cannot be liable for permitting the use, unless the person using would be liable. If an office or place be opened, kept, or used for the purpose of betting with persons resorting thereto, that is, to the office or place, then the person using and the owner permitting user would both be liable to penalties. But if there be no user there can be no permission, and if user means exclusive user, there was none in the Newmarket Ring. The decisions to which reference has been made all assume the necessity of satisfying this requirement of an office or place capable, at least temporarily, of exclusive user. Even the umbrella and stool would satisfy, although not exuberantly, this requirement. The construction which is now suggested derives support from the words which next follow in the section. "Any person having the care or management of, or in any manner assisting in conducting the business of any house, office, room, or place, opened, kept, or used for the purposes aforesaid," shall also be liable to a penalty. Here there must clearly be a "place" capable of exclusive occupation, and it seems reasonable that this word should have the same meaning throughout the section.

This construction is, however, opposed to the most recent case on the subject in which the occupier of an enclosed ground, called the Borough Park Ground, was convicted under the Act for permitting such place to be used by other persons for the purpose of betting on a pigeon-shooting match. The public were admitted to these grounds on payment of money, and betting-men were seen there playing their vocation. After the pigeon-shooting there was a foot-race, on which also bets were made in the same manner. Two Judges of the Queen's Bench held that this conviction was right, or, in other words, that a place—namely, Borough Park Ground—was used for the purpose of betting with persons resorting thereto, and that the occupier permitted this use. If this decision be right, it will have extensive effect. There are many enclosed grounds where foot-races and other athletic contests take place in the presence of large numbers of persons who pay for admission, and among whom betting goes on. If the occupier can be reasonably supposed to know that betting does go on, he will be liable to a penalty for permitting the ground to be used for the purpose of betting with persons resorting thereto. It is stated that at Borough Park Ground bookmakers were present who shouted out the odds, and this is a usual feature of all such assemblies. We do not think, however, that anything turns upon the calling out of the odds or on the fact that the persons calling out were, or were supposed to be, bookmakers. If the Judges relied on these facts as showing that betting was carried on as a business, then we think there ought to be something in the nature of an "office" where this business could be transacted. It is not only foot-races and such comparatively obscure "events" that would be affected by this decision. There is usually some betting upon a cricket-match at Lord's, and it might be argued that that is a "place" which the occupier permits to be used for the purpose of betting with persons resorting thereto.

The recent case before the Edgeware bench of magistrates appears, when explained, to be in harmony with those decisions of the Superior Courts which we have treated as unquestionable law. Mr. Serjeant Cox, Chairman of the Bench, states in a letter to the *Standard* that the defendant in this case was lessee of Kingsbury Racecourse, upon part of which betting-stalls were placed, which were occupied by well-known betting-men who affixed their names and lists, and transacted business in the usual way. Upon these facts the conviction of the lessee of the racecourse who permitted the user of the stalls was inevitable. But Mr. Serjeant Cox points out that the decision does not interfere with betting between persons who come together casually, but only the "trade of betting," for the carrying on of which there must be a place at which the trader can be found and the business transacted. Thus we come back to the question whether the ring at Newmarket is a "place" within the Act, and we incline to think that it is not. Betting is not unlawful, and if a number of persons who take pleasure in betting on horse-races select a convenient spot near a racecourse to meet and bet with one another, this is a ring. But that which is lawful for two or three does not become unlawful when done by a hundred. Nor can it make any difference that some of the assembly bet for pleasure and others as matter of business, or that shouts of "three to one, bar one," are heard proceeding from an excited crowd. The magistrates in the Newmarket case refused to convict; but the case will come before a superior Court, and the importance of the question will ensure its being thoroughly argued.

Without disrespect to the judges who are to decide what the law is, we may venture to say what we think the law ought to be. Anything that may fairly be described as a betting-office ought to be put down; but the law could not stop betting if it would, and it is idle to persecute that which cannot be prevented.

#### THE ITALIAN OPERAS.

ABOUT the Royal Italian Opera, Covent Garden, which closed its doors last Saturday, there is nothing more to record, and it only remains for us to fulfil our promise of giving a brief summary of what, since our last notice, has been done at the theatre over the way. The Director of Her Majesty's Opera has vouchsafed to his supporters a new Italian adaptation of a French lyric comedy known in England for some thirty years, and an original ("posthumous") work by a native-born musician. Otherwise, in the production of novelty Mr. Mapleson has not been more enterprising than Mr. Gye. The old time-worn operas presented over and over again, however intrinsically good, however well performed, begin to pall upon the ear. Among them, for example, were *Semiramide*, the *Trovatore*, the *Sonnambula*, *Fidelio* (always welcome with Mlle. Tietjens as Leonora), *Rigoletto*, *Norma*, the *Favorita*, *Faust*, the *Huguenots*, *Martha*, the *Traviata*, *Caterina* (*Les Diamans de la Couronne*), the *Nozze di Figaro*, *Lucrezia Borgia*, *Lucia di Lammermoor*, the *Flauto Magico*, the *Talismano*, and lastly *Don Giovanni*—eighteen in all. A new description of any of the best known among these would not merely be a tax upon our own invention, but a still severer one upon the patience of our readers. What has been already said in reference to Covent Garden would apply with equal truth to Drury Lane. We have already given a history of the season extending as far as the *début* of Mr. Mapleson's most attractive new *prima donna*, Mlle. Louise Singelli (born Singelé), the return of Mme. Christine Nilsson, and the production of *Il Talismano*. The "posthumous" work of our compatriot, Michael W. Balfe, has probably done more than anything else this year to keep up the prestige of Her Majesty's Opera. That it was ever produced at all is due to the good will and zealous exertions of a distinguished foreigner; and those who believe that such a thing as English dramatic music is possible in a country where, before Handel was known among us, Henry Purcell lived and wrote, are deeply indebted to Mme. Christine Nilsson. She not only volunteered to study Edith Plantagenet, but studied to such purpose as to make herself perfect mistress of the part. Further than this, Mme. Nilsson persisted in showing that the interest she felt in Balfe was genuine. *Il Talismano* has had no fewer than nine performances—something unprecedented for a work composed by an Englishman and produced in an Italian Opera-house. Edith Plantagenet is now a familiar object in the public eye; and Walter Scott himself might have recognized his own creation in the personality of the gifted Swedish lady. We should like to be able to say that the other characters in *Il Talismano* were equally well sustained, but to do so would be to violate truth. Mlle. Marie Roze, upon whom devolved the part of Queen Berengaria, is alone a worthy associate for such an Edith as Mme. Nilsson. The *Cœur de Lion* of Signor Rota is tame and insipid, nor can any other epithets be fairly bestowed upon Signor Campanini's Knight of the Leopard. The Nectabanus of Signor Catalini is at the best a caricature. No one could be deceived by such grotesque buffoonery—least likely of all a cavalier so brave and self-controlled as the Knight of the Leopard. The performance of *Il Talismano*, as regards *ensemble*, is highly creditable to the orchestra, the chorus, and their practised chief, Sir Michael Costa, who appears to have taken more than usual interest in its production. Costa and Balfe (who also should have been Sir Michael) were old and intimate associates, nor was their friendship ever disturbed by the fact of their being in some sort rivals, Balfe succeeding Costa as director of the music at Her Majesty's Theatre, under Mr. Lumley, while Costa exercised despotic sway at the opposition establishment in Covent Garden—now the Royal Italian Opera. No care, or expense, has been grudged by the management in affording the best chances of success to *Il Talismano*. Mr. W. Beverley still holding the post of "scenic artist," as the term is, has, it need scarcely be added, played a part of more or less importance in the general "getting up." To conclude—the public like *Il Talismano*, and more than like the charming representative of Edith Plantagenet. The opera is now pretty sure of keeping its place in the repertory. To affirm that it is the best thing of the kind which Balfe has produced would be to overestimate its worth; but to say that it exhibits most of those engaging qualities to which he was indebted for the universal popularity he enjoyed is to state the simple truth. An analysis of one of Balfe's operas is superfluous. There is nothing to analyse. Like the fixed stars, they are self-luminous; and probably if, by the aid of scientific appliances, we got nearer to them, we should not like them so much. At all events, we might detect spots, the discovery of which, in no way benefiting either art or science, would answer no desirable purpose. Enough that the *Talismano* charms, after Balfe's usual way of charming, and like all he bequeathed to the world, is on that account alone acceptable. Her Majesty's Opera closed on Monday night, the work selected being *Don Giovanni*, given (*proh pudor!*) for the first time this season. The occasion was the "benefit" of Mr. Mapleson—an

expression not easy to define, seeing that he is both lessee and manager. The performance, if not altogether what might have been desired, offered several features calling for unreserved eulogy. Some of the drawbacks occurred precisely where the greatest efficiency is looked for. *Don Giovanni* without a hero, but for the unceasing tunefulness and charm of Mozart's incomparable music, would be scarcely tolerable. Here was a case in point. Not many lyric comedians of our time have brought so few qualifications to the adequate embodiment of this most trying of all operatic parts as Signor Di Reschi. Of the *vis dramatica* he has little; of the *vis comica* he has less; nor does his singing by any means atone for the absence of histrionic ability. Signor Di Reschi's *Don Giovanni* was, indeed, a failure—and no wonder. Then, the Leporello of Herr Behrens is deficient in humour; nor does his singing make up for what in other respects is wanting. The Don Ottavio of Signor Gillandi, despite a graceful stage-bearing and prepossessing appearance—occasionally, as in the case of Signor Nicolini, at the other house, reminding us of Mario—is, at the best, mediocre. Nothing can be less satisfactory than his phrasing in "Il mio tesoro," the most prominent vocal display awarded to the lackadaisical hero, always threatening to do something and ending with doing nothing in particular. Signor Gillandi is scarcely more to be admired in "Dalla sua pace," though he deserves praise for retaining that most expressive and melodious air, which some of our Ottavios persistently omit. True, like the great *scena* of Elvira, "Dalla sua pace" does not belong to the original score, being one of the "appendix" pieces written expressly for Vienna, after the opera had been already produced at Prague; but it is so judiciously interpolated by the composer that to disconnect it now from the general plan becomes no easy matter. The three women are far better represented at Drury Lane than the three men. About so familiar a performance as the Donna Anna of Mlle. Tietjens it is needless to speak. She sings the music, as we all know, perfectly; and her acting is equal to her singing, which involves a compliment both ways. The Zerlina of Mlle. Singelli is one of the most simple and unaffected portraiture of that too frequently overdrawn character we have seen. The idea of so exquisitely refined and artificially coquettish a Zerlina as that which Mme. Adelina Patti presents being attached to a stupid boor like Masetto is preposterous. Mlle. Singelli takes another, and we cannot but think more natural, view. She looks and acts just as much like a peasant as Masetto himself. That she does not sing with such marvellous address as Mme. Patti is true. Nevertheless she sings well enough to entitle her to add one more to the laurels previously won in Caterina, Lady Enrichetta, and the "Queen of the Night." No newcomer for some years past has been more welcome than this very engaging and unobtrusive artist, to whose reappearance at Her Majesty's Opera next season every amateur will anxiously look forward. Side by side with the Donna Anna of Mlle. Tietjens was the Donna Elvira of Mme. Nilsson. The fair Scandinavian must surely have read Hoffmann's ideal *Don Juan*. If not, she has thought out the character for herself; and that says even more. We cannot imagine Don Giovanni's discarded wife more perfectly represented. Mme. Nilsson never seems to forget that she is the Elvira of the drama, or ever to think that she is Mme. Nilsson. One of the rarest qualities possessed by a dramatic singer is that of the art of listening, and being moved while some one else enjoys the exclusive right of speech. Mme. Nilsson exhibits this to the highest perfection in the scene where Leporello, in that wonderful air, "Madamina," discloses to Elvira the many infidelities of her inconstant spouse. No one required to be told that she was an actress. She had already proved so much in her delineations of Lucia, Desdemona, and Mignon, and this year still more emphatically asserted her claim to rank among the lyric tragedians of the day by her performances in the *Travatore* and the *Huguenots*; for although she only played Leonora once, and Valentine once, nothing more was required to settle the question in the minds of connoisseurs. After Mme. Nilsson's Donna Elvira further discussion as to her histrionic ability would be superfluous. In Germany, the country of Mozart, where *Don Juan* first saw the light, Elvira has always been regarded as the most important, no less than the most interesting, female character. Mme. Nilsson, on Monday night, completely justified this view. How she sings the music may easily be understood. It is worth noting that at the performance of *Don Giovanni*, as at the last of *Fidelio* (in which Mlle. Tietjens was never more superb), the so-called "normal diapason" was abandoned for the old and higher pitch. It now becomes a question which of the two is henceforth to be used, because to coquet between them would be absurd. Our opinion has been long ago stated, and it is not necessary to re-state it. We may, however, just add that the high pitch makes the orchestra sound more brilliant, while the low pitch is so convenient to singers that few of them object.

We have already named and commented upon most of the artists newly presented to the public by Mr. Mapleson, and merely recur to the subject with a view of pointing out how plentiful were his resources. To specify a few instances—for the *Huguenots* he had three tenors, Fancelli, Achard, and Campanini, competent to play, and who did play, Raoul; he had also two representatives of Lady Enrichetta (*Marta*), Mlles. Valleria and Singelli; two for Gilda (*Rigoletto*), Mlles. Lodi and Risarelli; three for Margaret (*Faust*), Mme. Nilsson, Mlles. Valleria and Marie Roze; three for Faust, Mr. Bentham, Signors Naudin and Campanini; two for Leonora (*Il Travatore*), Mlle. Tietjens and Mme. Christine Nilsson; two for Valentine, in the *Huguenots* (the same); two for Florestan (*Fidelio*), Signors Urio and Campanini;

two for the Duke (*Rigoletto*), Signors Naudin and Gillandi; two for Lionello (*Martha*), Signors Ramini and Campanini; two for Assur (*Semiramide*), Signors Agnesi and Rota—&c. Add to these Mme. Trebelli-Bettini, Mlle. Bauermeister, Signor Galassi, Signor Perkins, with others who have been named *en passant*, or are too many to name, and it will be readily admitted that Mr. Mapleson possesses a company with which he might have made a great deal more than he has actually done. That the season, in spite of these resources, brought forth very little to remember none can dispute. The prospectus was unusually modest in tone, and the actual results were in proportion. What became of *Roberto Devereux*, *Fra Diavolo*, *Otello*, and *Ernani*—all promised—only Mr. Mapleson, or Sir Michael Costa, can inform us.

## REVIEWS.

### PERSIA, ANCIENT AND MODERN.\*

THAT the visit of the Shah of Persia should have stimulated researches in regard to the past and present condition of that country was exactly what might have been expected. While some journalists expatiated on the advantages likely to result from the concession to Baron Reuter, and others were busied in detecting Russian aggression thinly veiled by diplomacy, Mr. Clements Markham employed his leisure in compressing an immense amount of information into a thick volume, which we recently reviewed. Fortunately or unfortunately, Special Correspondents have not yet invaded or parcelled out the Shah's dominions. The famine of 1870 was not described by a graphic pen, and no one has told us, with suitable pomp of language, what effect was produced on the minds of the natives by the cutting of the first sod of the line from Reshed to Tabreez. Pending therefore the remote time when the districts round Teheran or Shiraz shall become a legitimate part of an autumnal tour, or shall be as well known as the bazaars of Tirkoot or Chumparun, Mr. Piggot has endeavoured both to create a desire for accurate information about an ancient kingdom, and to supply it. And we are bound to say that in little more than three hundred pages he has succeeded in his aim of giving us "a fair general view of ancient and modern Persian history, supplemented by chapters on the religion, literature, commerce, arts, sciences, army, education, language, sport, &c., of the country." We do not make out that the author is anything of an Orientalist, or that he has ever even got as far as Tiflis on his way to Teheran. But he has read up to the level of his subject; old and new authorities have been explored and digested; the style is clear and unambitious; and his compilation is well planned and is not too long. We observe that while he has consulted Sir William Jones, he makes no mention of an excellent grammar and dialogues published by the late Mirza Mohammed Ibrahim, though he says correctly enough that the Mirza translated the Book of Isaiah into choice Persian and was attached to the old East India College at Haileybury. There must still be several persons living who well recollect the appearance of the Mirza in London society some thirty years ago; his piercing eyes, his aquiline nose, his wonderful mastery over the English language, his amusing way of contrasting Persian life and manners with English, and the power of polite and effective repartee so characteristic of his lineage and nation. We observe also that the author repeats what we cannot but consider as the error of Mr. Mounsey in deriving the word Feringi from the Varangians or colony of Englishmen and Danes who fled to the Byzantine Court from the tyranny of the Norman Conquest. Gibbon, who mentions the fact with the pithy remark that "pilgrimage and piracy had approximated the countries of the earth," says nothing of the kind; nor does Scott allude to any such derivation in *Count Robert of Paris*. The belief of most Orientalists is that Feringi or Farangi is nothing more than Frank writ large, and Farangistan or Europe, with the vagueness of Arab or Persian writers, is simply the place or country of the Franks. One other and more incontestable error on the author's part we are bound to notice. Writing of the celebrated diamond, the Koh-i-nur, now placed with other regalia in the Tower, he says that this jewel came into the "possession of Nadir Shah by the exercise of a very clever trick"; and he then goes on to say that, when re-establishing the fallen monarch of India on the throne of Delhi, Nadir compelled his *protégé* to exchange turbans in token of amity, and so got possessed of the "Mountain of Light." Mr. Piggot has ascribed to the ruthless conqueror who sacked Delhi the stratagem really executed by the astute old Sikh, Runjeet Sing, in 1812. The Lion of Lahore wanted to buy the gem for about 5,000l. of our money, and, failing this, induced Shah Shoojah by vain promises of jaghirs and assistance to exchange turbans as a pledge of eternal friendship. The story may be found in any ordinary History of India, and is well told at length in the sixth chapter of Sir John Kaye's well-known *History of the War in Afghanistan*, to say nothing of Mr. Eastwick, to whom Mr. Piggot refers. Nadir Shah, we may observe, when he gave the order for the sack of Delhi from a little mosque which is still shown to inquiring tourists at that city, had no need whatever to resort to artifice. He had the Mogul capital, its King, princes, and merchants literally at his feet. Elphinstone, who digested the best authorities, says that Nadir took possession of the Imperial

\* *Persia, Ancient and Modern*. By John Piggot, F.S.A., F.G.S., F.R.G.S. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1874.



treasures and jewels, including the celebrated Peacock Throne, plundered the nobles, extorted large sums from traders and bankers by every species of cruelty, and made the cry of affliction resound in every house. A victorious monarch at the head of nearly seventy thousand fighting men, besides a horde of camp followers, is not called on to play the part of a diplomatic Artful Dodger.

We have so recently reviewed the salient points of Persian history, while dealing with Mr. Markham's trustworthy and useful compilation, that we purpose to restrict ourselves in this paper to two main topics. The Persian King is known to be the possessor of magnificent jewels; and Persia itself is said by some to be a perfect mine of unproductive or unexplored wealth. Let us see what can be made of the kingdom under these two aspects, not only from Mr. Pigott's pages, but from the travellers and authors whom he freely and pertinently quotes.

Sir John Malcolm, Mr. Eastwick, and Mr. Mounsey, all three employed at various epochs in our diplomatic service at Teheran, have described the crown jewels of Persia at some length. Mr. Eastwick, who also enjoys the rather perilous distinction of being one of the few Europeans, and probably the only Englishman, who has penetrated to the shrine of Imam Reza at Meshed, has given as full a description of the inner chamber of valuables as the shortness of his visit and the dazzling nature of the materials would allow. The star of the collection is the "Darya-i-nur," or "Sea of Light," twin sister to the "Mountain of Light" to which we have just alluded. It is difficult to assign a precise or even a probable value to a diamond one inch and a half long, one inch broad, and three-eighths of an inch thick. But there seems no reason to doubt that it has a history of its own reaching back into what Wordsworth terms "the mists of fabled time," and that its merit lies, not in its brilliancy, but in its smoothness, extent, and thickness. A lesser diamond, called similarly the Darya-i-nur from its similarity of shape, fell into our possession at the final conquest at the Punjab, and, after some years of uneventful repose, was sold to a Mohammedan gentleman of wealth, influence, and undoubted loyalty, resident at Dacca, the capital of Eastern Bengal. The price paid, if we remember rightly, was the not very exorbitant sum of 6,000*l*. Another splendid specimen in the Shah's treasure-house is the Taj-i-Huma, or "diadem of the Phoenix." A third is known as the famous Pitt diamond, brought from Madras by Governor Pitt, who was, we beg to observe, grandfather of the Great Commoner, and not great-grandfather, as Mr. Pigott states. This jewel went from the Pitt family to the Duke of Orleans, the Regent; from the Duke to Napoleon I., from Napoleon to Talleyrand; thence, after some vicissitudes, to George IV.; and from this connoisseur in dress and haberdashery, by the hands of Sir Harford Jones, to Futtah Ali Shah. It is now admirably set in a ring. A fourth is celebrated as the "Crown of the Moon." Besides the above, the Shah possesses an emerald as big as a walnut, an uncut ruby like a hen's egg, and the finest turquoise in the world, without a flaw, and three or four inches long. Jewels and stones of smaller size and value seem to baffle description. Swords and drinking bowls, aigrettes and epaulettes, flash their rays on the amazed visitor, while trays of pearls, and sapphires and rubies not much bigger than nuts or marbles, like silver in the days of Solomon, seem of no account at all. These treasures are conjectured to be worth six or seven millions of our money, and they are most fittingly entrusted to a high Persian dignitary, rich, bigoted, and reserved, who keeps them shut up in a small room, twenty feet by fourteen, at the top of a stair uncomfortably steep. The obvious reflections to be drawn from the by no means exaggerated accounts of these regalia are, that the poorest country in the world, looking to its extent, history, and associations, possesses the most splendid aggregate of useless or unfruitful capital. It seems a shocking anomaly that a sovereign with an annual revenue of only two millions of our money, should possess diamonds estimated at three times that amount, and this in a country where there is not a decent mile of road, where agriculture is stationary, where transit is insecure, where commerce does not advance, where, during the last three years, populous villages and tracts have been desolated by disease and famine, without the least effort on the part of the ruling power to stem or mitigate the disaster.

If we turn from the contemplation of wealth, nearly every item of which is an epitome of the raids, conquests, spoliation, and changes that make up the history of Persia, to the natural resources of the country, the prospect is even more dispiriting, dismal, and barren. Ruts and tracks instead of highways, caravanserais in ruins, the noble causeways of Shah Abbas impracticable for horsemen, embankments in decay, watercourses silted up, huge tracts entirely destitute of vegetation, others where the timber is cut down and wastefully converted to charcoal, while veins of coal remain unexplored, capitals with a diminishing population numerically unequal to that of a third-rate Continental town—these are characteristics which cause all but ardent enthusiasts to despair utterly of a Persian revival. Yet there are no doubt parts of the country in which, in spite of misgovernment, a moderate supply of water and a reasonable amount of labour work miracles in the shape of agricultural returns. The peasant, driven away from the main channels of communication such as they are, by requisitions for labour and by ceaseless exactions, takes refuge in remoter villages, buried in the midst of fruit and other trees. Mr. Binning, who had a competent knowledge of Persian and considerable Indian experience to direct him, saw on his tour a great quantity of the cereals and pulses familiar to him in Southern India. Indian corn of two kinds, millet,

lentils, vetches at one season; and wheat and barley at another, alternate with the wild liquorice and the camel's thorn. Lady Sheil writes enthusiastically of the roses which at Teheran come in towards the close of April, burst into full bloom at once, and are all over by the middle of May. In the valley of Gilpaegan, in Central Persia, grain has been so abundant as to have a mere nominal market value; and its melon fields extend, it is credibly asserted, to half a mile in breadth and three or four miles in length. It is perhaps a mere native exaggeration to say that some of the melons, when full ripe, burst open at the sound made by a fast-trotting horse over a hard piece of clay or rock. Great pains are expended on the production of tobacco. It is sown in ridges in ground impregnated with saltpetre, covered with bushes and rubbish, watered at intervals, and next planted out into other ridges which have been carefully ploughed and manured. There is also a considerable production of silk. Rice is soaked previously to sowing; and indeed so dry is the Persian climate that this process appears necessary for all food grains before and immediately after they are put in the ground. In most of the rice-growing tracts of India the soil will retain the moisture of a tropical shower for several days, and the Ryot is often as apprehensive lest the seed should rot, or the young shoots be drowned by successive downfalls when they are no longer wanted, as he is of an inopportune failure of rain. No one travelling in the northern part of the Persian Empire can form a just idea of the climate or of natural and animal productions of the central and southern provinces, or can accurately estimate the obstacles in the way of commercial and agricultural development. In Mazenderan and Giljan the hills are beautifully wooded. The jungles swarm with tigers, deer, or hogs. The valleys are rice-fields or swamps, and waterfowl of all kinds, with fevers, miasma, and mosquitoes, remind the traveller of parts of the plains of Bengal.

Whatever may be the varieties of climate and produce in Persia, the modes of collecting the Government revenue, though varying, appear to be uniformly and perversely bad. The land tax, immemorial in Persia as in India and Egypt, is collected or given away before collection, by *barats*—i.e. assignments made to the creditors of Government. These assignments are constantly quoted, if such a mercantile term can be applied to Persia, at fifty per cent. discount. Other lands belong to the King as part of his privy purse, and are let out to cultivators, in the most primitive fashion, for one-half the produce. Another portion is alienated to priests and Moollahs. No one cognizant of Oriental ways will be surprised to hear of additional, irregular, and vexatious imposts. Presents must be made to officials at the New Year. Governors, taking charge of a province or district, expect a similar compliment at such times, and any emergency of births, deaths, or marriages, is made the excuse for "benevolences," which are dexterously shifted from each class in succession, till they fall on the cultivating or the lower classes. It is ridiculous, as we have already pointed out, to expect that these practices, backed by unlimited power and the precedents of thirty centuries, will be abandoned, and that Persian nature will be reformed, simply because an active speculator has surprised the Shah into an impracticable concession. It could not be worked without arousing that spirit of obstinate resistance or forcible demonstration which is the last resource of the oppressed working-man of the East. In America, it has been pertinently remarked, railroads may precede and need not follow civilization. The prairie is traversed, and a city with post-offices and telegraphs, saw-mills and counting-houses, springs up at the terminus of the new line. But the *liyats* and the sandy deserts are not so easily disposed of as the Red Indians and the hunting-grounds. Nor is it fair to expect that India, with its rich soil, its splendid rainfall, and the strict and searching system of its paternal bureaucracy, will afford the smallest criterion of the probable success of railroads and telegraphs in the land of the Shah. We do not of course imagine that this potentate will ever comprehend that his inherited palatial splendours are in hideous contrast to the poverty of his provinces; that he is like an ancient dowager who flaunts her diamonds when she cannot pay her butcher's bill; that he had far better have a reduced army, a rough but impartial administration of justice, a system of highways, and a moderate national debt, than boast an avalanche of brilliants, or a hailstorm of precious stones. The first object of our foreign policy should be to keep Persia independent; the second, to teach the Shah and his Ministers the common rudiments of progressive civilization. But it is idle to imagine, as some writers have done, that the presence of a few engineers in the Northern provinces, or the arrival of a dozen additional steamers at the Southern ports of Bushire or Bunder Abbas, will remove evils which date, at least, from the domination of Chenghiz or Timur.

#### FROUDE'S ENGLISH IN IRELAND.—VOL. III.\*

IT is in Mr. Froude's third volume that the charges which we have brought against his present work reach their climax. It is here that we see in all its fulness that perversion of the moral sense which is the main characteristic of the whole book. Mr. Froude's later and graver errors spring naturally out of the

\* *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century.* By James Anthony Froude, M.A. In Three Volumes. Vol. III. London: Longmans & Co. 1874.

lighter faults of his earlier writings. The habit of playing with right and wrong in cases where right and wrong are perhaps not so clearly marked as in some others—the habit of playing with evidence, of putting out of sight the inconvenient facts which tell against a favourite theory—the general recklessness natural to one who takes up history not as the serious work of a life, but as something to fill up the hours which he feels hang heavy—all this now brings forth its natural fruit. We readily believe that, even in the volume before us, Mr. Froude is not guilty of conscious falsehood, of conscious misrepresentation of evidence. He may have reached the point at which it is no longer by any conscious act, but by the common process of what has become to him a second nature, that he looks lightly on crimes done on his own side, while he keeps the full perception, or perhaps more than the full perception, of crimes done on the other side. It may not be by any conscious act that, when he has to deal with an evil deed done by an Irish rebel, the picture is drawn in minute detail, and wrought up with every aggravation that can be thought of; but that when the like deeds are done by soldiers, magistrates, noblemen, engaged in putting down Irish rebels, then there is no word of condemnation to be found in Mr. Froude's copious vocabulary. Instead of condemnation all that we get is a laugh, a sneer, a merry rubbing of the hands, sometimes an evident delight in the record of wrong and suffering, sometimes an insinuation of guilt in the sufferer or of falsehood in the narrator, when no proof of guilt or falsehood is even attempted. All this may, in Mr. Froude's present temper, come so naturally to him that he hardly knows that he is sinning against the first laws of historic truth, against the first laws of common morality. We can only say that, if this be so, here is indeed a warning against trifling with truth in the smallest matter. In dealing with such a volume as this all purely literary criticism is out of place. We have now no mind to dwell on sentences which sin against the first rules of grammar, on dates which contradict themselves on the same page, on statements of law so wild that one doubts for a moment whether they must not have some groundwork. All these things we are used to in Mr. Froude's writings, and any careful reader may mark them for himself. We need not dwell here on the solemn denunciations of principles on which civilized nations are agreed, on such solemn sayings as "how to live well is the most difficult of arts"—an art perhaps so difficult that only Henry the Eighth and Lord Clare have perfectly mastered it. We may pass by chatter about democracies being "proverbially shortlived," as pardonable in one who has doubtless never given a moment of serious thought to the history of any democracy, ancient or modern. Those principles of public morality on which all honest men, all civilized nations are agreed, will not seriously suffer, though Mr. Froude chooses to sneer at them as the "flatulent"—most things are now "flatulent" with Mr. Froude, as they used to be "hysterical"—"conceit of liberalism." In dealing with this book we have to deal with graver matters; we have to deal with a writer who stands forward as the apologist of oppression, torture, and murder, with a writer who runs cheerily and gleefully through the illegal deeds of Lord Carhampton and the fouler atrocities of "Flogging Fitzgerald," and who can dismiss with a sneer and an insinuation so black a deed of blood as the execution of Sir Edward Crosbie. As we read through the exulting pages in which Mr. Froude records these horrors, we are tempted to think at every step of the girl in the *Last Days of Pompeii*, who looks forward to the "merry, merry show" when each wild beast will have its human prey, and who bursts forth into glee when a victim is found for the tiger as well as for the lion.

Such a comparison as this may suggest a distinction which may not unfairly be drawn between what we may fairly call the heroes—though to be sure the exploits of one of them are somewhat unfairly summed up in a single page—of Mr. Froude's present volume. The history of the Irish Rebellion of 1798 teaches us one lesson as to the proper way of putting down such movements. Nothing but Mr. Froude's talk could ever lead any man to doubt for a moment that it was the duty of the Government to put down that rebellion with all vigour. But it is perfectly plain that for such work none but disciplined soldiers can be trusted; such work is their business, and they lie under no particular temptation to do anything beyond the received usages of war. Lord Cornwallis and Sir Ralph Abercromby, military men of high reputation, and whom we never before heard spoken of without respect, behaved with humanity, and are of course sneered at by Mr. Froude for so doing. The chief doers of evil were those who were not making war simply as a matter of ordinary duty, but who were pouring forth the stores of long-standing hatred against their countrymen of another race and faith. When the native Papists rose and the Protestant yeomanry were let loose upon them, the strife was like the strife between oligarchs and democrats at Coreysa. And, according to the sound old doctrine that "corruptio optimi est pessima," when the civil magistrate forsakes his proper duties and makes himself the instrument of partisan vengeance, his deeds are the worst of all. Let us look through some of the more remarkable cases in which these different classes of people appear in Mr. Froude's story. We may point out by the way Mr. Froude's unfair fashion of speaking as if the United Irishmen had been an unlawful and rebellious body from the beginning. In point of fact, their position is much better described by Mr. Massey when he says that "the society of United Irishmen, which had hitherto pursued lawful objects, by lawful means, at this time changed its character; and, from being a public body, with an

avowed policy, became a secret association, whose councils were not divulged." We do not defend any illegal action on either side, but in the state of Ireland then it was really nothing wonderful if men who failed to gain lawful objects by lawful means fell step by step into seeking unlawful objects by unlawful means. Looking at the matter from one point of view, the men who sought for French help against the established Government of the country naturally seem, not mere rebels, but traitors. But from their point of view, France was no more foreign than England. England was an enemy, while France bade fair to be a friend. The justifiableness of the rebellion is one of those points which it is simply idle to discuss. Whether right or wrong in abstract morality, it was what, according to the common laws of human nature, could not fail to happen whenever there was a chance for it. The Government, on the other hand, did only the duty of a Government in putting down the rebellion. The only question is as to the particular acts of both sides. On the crimes of the rebels we need not enlarge; Mr. Froude has done that already. But we must again say that crimes done by an ignorant and down-trodden peasantry are not to be judged by the same standard as crimes done by men who by their position ought to know better—gentlemen, noblemen, civil officers of high rank. We will now give a specimen of the ingenious way in which Mr. Froude knows how to deal with history to serve his own purposes. He begins a section in this oracular fashion:—

Students of later Irish history are familiar with the ferocious cruelties inflicted by General Lake's army on the Irish peasantry in the spring of 1798, the free quarters, the burnt villages, the pitch-caps, the triangle, and the lash. To these outrages it has pleased the Irish to attribute the insurrection. England, ever stern in extremities, ever penitent when the danger is over, and inclined to shift the blame upon her instruments, has allowed this legend, like so many others, to pass unrefuted, and has permitted one more illusion to swell the volume of Ireland's imaginary wrongs. An attention to dates would have sufficed to reduce the charge to modest dimensions. Lake did not take the command-in-chief till the 23rd of April. On the 24th of May the rebellion burst. The atrocities which are supposed to have caused it were therefore limited to a single month.

A month then of atrocities of this kind is in Mr. Froude's eyes a very small matter, something, it would seem, which a mere Irish Papist ought to receive with feelings of thankfulness that he has got only a small part of his due. But what fair man would dwell on the deeds done in 1798 by one side only? Mr. Froude goes on to say how much longer the evil deeds on the one side had been going on, how "for seven years an invisible authority ruled over the four provinces with a code of laws enforced by dagger, pike, pistol, and houghing-knife." We do not at all deny it; we are no apologists of the rebels; we only ask that it should be remembered that for a good many years before 1798 an authority which was by no means invisible had been ruling over the four provinces, and had for its code whatever seemed good to the Luttrells and Fitzgeralds of Mr. Froude's admiration, and enforced by whatever instruments of torture they might think good to use. In 1795 a certain General Luttrell, Lord Carhampton, known in English history as the Colonel Luttrell whom the electors of Middlesex did not prefer to Wilkes, was let loose on the province of Connaught. Over his doings Mr. Froude chuckles with the delight which a breach of law usually awakens in him:—

Carhampton was able to arrest many of the Connaught leaders; and legal trials being from the nature of the case impossible, he trusted to Parliament for an Act of Indemnity, and sent them by scores to serve in the fleet. Thus, amidst the shrieks of patriots and threats of prosecution, he succeeded in restoring some outward show of order.

An Act of Indemnity he did get, and that Act of Indemnity, as quoted by Mr. Froude himself, recounted how "magistrates and other officers have apprehended and sent suspected persons out of the kingdom, have seized arms and entered houses, and done divers acts not justifiable according to law." Mr. Massey tells us a little more than it was convenient to Mr. Froude to tell us of these unjustifiable doings:—

Bands of marauders traversed the country, plundering and destroying houses and property. The Government, instead of repressing these outrages with firmness and moderation, aided the savage policy of retaliation, to which the exasperated Protestants were too willing to resort. Lord Carhampton, the general commanding the troops in the disturbed districts, let loose his troops upon the wretched peasantry. It was enough for a magistrate, a squire, or even a farmer, to point out any person as suspected, to have his habitation burnt down, his family turned adrift, and himself either shot or transported, without trial, without warrant, without enquiry. An Act of Indemnity was passed, by the Irish Parliament, in the Session of 1796, to protect these enormities; and the Insurrection Act gave them, for the future, the sanction of law. The suspension of the Habeas Corpus completed this barbarous code, which, in effect, outlawed the whole people of Ireland.

Mr. Massey goes on to tell us a little more of the doings of the Protestant yeomanry, the Orangemen, among whom was, according to Mr. Froude, to be found all that was best and noblest in Ireland. The acts which to Mr. Froude are the materials for a triumphant scoff are pronounced by the calmer judgment of Mr. Massey to have "differed only in degree from the worst enormities of the French Revolution":—

Under the authority to search for concealed arms, any person whom any ruffian, calling himself a Protestant or a loyalist, and either with or without a military uniform, chose to suspect or to pretend to suspect, was liable to be seized, tortured, and put to death. Hundreds of unoffending people, and people who were guilty of no other offence than professing the creed of their fathers, or of letting fall a word of discontent, were flogged until they were insensible, or made to stand upon one foot on a pointed stake. These were the most ordinary punishments. Sometimes the wretched victim was half hanged, or the scalp was torn from the head by a pitched cap.



Mr. Massey goes on to describe the horrors of free quarters, and dwells specially on one point on which Mr. Froude does not find it convenient to say a word. This is the brutality everywhere shown to the women. "It was boasted by officers of rank that within certain large districts no home had been left undefiled." And it is allowed at all hands that the rebels of 1798, in their worst moments, did not retaliate in kind. All this Mr. Froude leaves out, but he takes care to sneer at Sir Ralph Abercromby for trying to bring the wretches whom he was sent to command into some kind of order. Abercromby is charged with putting out, in the interests of humanity, a general order superseding the harsher orders of Lord Camden. For this Mr. Froude hurls some pages of censure at his head. He was "insubordinate," "utterly wrong and headstrong," because he thought justice and mercy higher than the bidding of a Lord-Lieutenant. Carhampton had trampled right and law under foot; that was only a good joke. On the other hand, when Abercromby had been driven from his post by the men whom he so justly spoke of as "formidable to everybody but the enemy," but when his humane policy had actually been adopted, when Lord Castlereagh had written to General Lake to stop the practice of free quarters, a certain Sir James Stewart took upon himself to put out an order which Mr. Massey rightly calls "of the most violent and absurd character":—

It denounced a practice which had been adopted in some of the prescribed districts of subscribing to provide forage and accommodation for the soldiers quartered upon them, for the purpose of evading the burden and punishment intended to be inflicted on the inhabitants individually. It declared that whenever such a practice was adopted the troops at free quarters should be increased double, treble, and fourfold; and that the districts should not be relieved from the presence of those troops until all arms were surrendered and tranquillity perfectly restored, and until it was reported to the general officers, by the gentlemen holding landed property, and those who were employed in collecting the public revenues and tithes, that all rents, taxes, and tithes were completely paid up.

Surely, if there can be such a thing as insubordination in a military officer, here is a specimen of it. But while Abercromby's "insubordination" in the cause of humanity becomes the object of Mr. Froude's revilings, Stewart's insubordination in the cause of cruelty is passed by altogether, and his name is not found in Mr. Froude's History.

A word must be given to the case of Sir Edward Crosbie, to which we referred in our first article. Before the attack of the rebels on Carlow they had gathered by night in Sir Edward's park, near the town. But no proof was brought that he in any way favoured them or had any dealings with them. His only crime seems to have been that he was, as Mr. Massey says, "a friend of Parliamentary Reform, and hostile to the oppression of the tenantry by their landlords." He was brought before a so-called court-martial, of which it is said that "the President was an illiterate fellow who could not spell." The witnesses against him were prisoners turned into witnesses by torture and promises of pardon. Loyalists who were anxious to give evidence in his favour were driven back at the point of the bayonet. After this kind of trial, Crosbie was condemned and at once hanged, and it is added that "his remains were abused in a manner shocking to humanity." For all this, Mr. Massey refers to Gordon's History of Ireland. Mr. Froude refers to Gordon also, but in his own peculiar style of inverted commas, by which he makes Gordon quote himself:—

"Crosbie was tried and executed as an accomplice—Mr. Gordon says unjustly; the extent of his fault being that he was 'an advanced theoretic politician.'—*History of the Rebellion*, p. 92. The distinction, probably, was more apparent than real. The insurgents were only endeavouring to take what the politicians told them England had no right to withhold.

Now it is plain that, when Mr. Froude wrote this note, he had these particulars before him. He either believed them or disbelieved them. If he disbelieved them, he should have given us his reasons for so doing. If he believed them, and wrote as he has written, we simply leave him to the judgment of every honest man.

And now, to wind up, for the famous case of "Flogging Fitzgerald." About him Mr. Froude is in such a specially sneering fit that every one who knows his manner feels sure that he has some ugly truth to keep out of sight. He has just before been doing his best to excuse the barbarity of the pitched-caps, and he does go so far as to pronounce a faltering disapproval; "Such things ought not to have been," but—this, that, and the other. Then we read, "Among the gentlemen"—it must always be borne in mind that we are dealing on one side with the crimes of gentlemen, on the other with the crimes of ignorant peasants—"whom history has been pleased to gibbet for his share in these transactions was Mr. Thomas Judkin Fitzgerald, the High Sheriff of Tipperary." So he is ushered in, and he is thus dismissed on the next page. "Fitzgerald has been rewarded with a black name in Irish legend and with the scorn of foolish historians." We venture again to quote one of the foolish historians. We wish we had space to quote the whole legend from the particularly foolish historian whom we have already more than once compared with Mr. Froude. But the doings which Mr. Froude slurs over in a little more than one page, the foul acts of Fitzgerald's injustice, cruelty, and falsehood, the successful action brought against him, the debates in Parliament on his conduct, the Act of Indemnity passed to screen him and his fellow-criminals, the second action which the Act of Indemnity made unsuccessful, the horror of the judge whom the new law compelled to direct a verdict in favour of the guilty, fill up nine pages of Mr. Massey's History, and would doubtless have taken up many more pages of Mr. Froude's if they had told the other way. We must however contrast the two descriptions of the one

among Fitzgerald's many crimes which Mr. Froude picks out for excuse. Mr. Froude says:—

This gentleman did, by decisive measures, effectually break the insurgent organization in Tipperary, so that when the rebellion came the most dangerous county in Ireland lay motionless. They were not gentle measures. He used the whip freely, and he made one mistake which was not forgotten. A man named Wright, at Clonmel, was suspected of connection with the United Irishmen. The suspicion in all likelihood was well founded. On searching him a letter was found in his pocket, in French. Fitzgerald did not understand the language, but his mind, like that of everyone else, was full of the expected French invasion. The letter, though utterly innocent, was treated as an evidence of guilt, and Wright was severely flogged. He prosecuted the High Sheriff afterwards, and recovered 500*l.* as damages.

Now let us hear Mr. Massey:—

Wright, hearing that he was suspected, and knowing the fearful consequences of suspicion, hastened to deliver himself up, in the hope that he might thus save his character and life. But Fitzgerald was not to be disappointed of his victim. He received Mr. Wright with a torrent of abuse, and ordered him to fall on his knees to receive his sentence. "You are a rebel," said he, "and a principal in this rebellion. You are to receive five hundred lashes, and then to be shot." The poor man begged for time, and was so rash as to ask for a trial. This aroused Fitzgerald to fury; he railed at his prisoner for daring to open his mouth after he was condemned. Wright was hurried to the flogging ladders, which were erected in the main street, and expecting immediate death, had placed his hat before his face while he muttered a prayer. Fitzgerald, with his own hand, tore away the hat, trampled on it, dragged his fainting victim by the hair, kicked him, and finally slashed him with a sword, drawing blood. Wright was then fastened to the ladder. Fifty lashes had been inflicted, when a Major Riall came up, and asked what Wright had done? The sheriff answered by flinging Riall a note, taken from the person of Wright, as a justification of the punishment to which he was subjected. The note was in French [Wright was a teacher of languages], a language of which Fitzgerald was wholly ignorant, and contained two lines excusing the writer for having failed in a visiting engagement. Riall assured Fitzgerald that the note was perfectly harmless; nevertheless the lash continued to descend, until the quivering entrails were visible through the flayed flesh. The hangman was then ordered to apply his thongs to a part of the body which had not yet been torn, while the sheriff himself went to the general in command of the district for an order to put his prisoner to death. This order, however, was not granted, and Wright was ultimately set at liberty.

All this, it must be remembered, was proved in court, and Fitzgerald defended himself by saying "that he was justified in taking any measures he thought fit to extort confessions from persons whom he suspected, and that if every other method failed, he had a right to cut off their heads." Of the trustworthiness of Mr. Massey's account, for which he refers throughout to public documents, there seems to be no kind of doubt, nor does Mr. Froude undertake to deny a single detail. He tells us that the English Government "so far acknowledged Fitzgerald's merit that they paid him his fine and created him a baronet." Here then we have a distinct statement of Fitzgerald's atrocities, which Mr. Froude does not deny, but for which his hardest words are that "he made one mistake." If then at any time Mr. Froude should speak of a severe flogging, we shall know what it means, and we also know the kind of merit which Mr. Froude, if he had the power, would reward with baronetcies, and seemingly with honours higher still.

We have now done. We trust that we have shown what is the character of the book with which we have been dealing. Mr. Froude's case is different from that of the most violent and most unfair party writer. We make some excuse for Irish Papists and Irish Protestants speaking of one another. But here is a writer who, with no temptation, no interest in the matter, without the poor excuse of national or religious rancour, puts himself forward in cold blood to defend the evil deeds of one side and to blacken those of the other. What may be Mr. Froude's motives we cannot guess; the only practical result of his labours can be to make old memories and present disputes bitterer than they need be. If Mr. Froude wished to stir up another Irish rebellion, to find new victims for new torturers, he could not take better means to compass his end. He stands alone in modern English historical literature as having habitually applied no small natural powers to a purpose which we can only pronounce immoral. The downward course is easy; the panegyrist of Henry the Eighth has sunk into the panegyrist of "Flogging Fitzgerald." If writings so flimsy and inaccurate as those of Mr. Froude live to be remembered in another age, it is something to think that they will carry their own moral condemnation with them. If the man who can jeer over the gibbet of Whiting in one age and the gibbet of Crosbie in another is to find any lasting place in men's memories, it is something to think that the character in which he will be remembered will not be as the defender of this or that doubtful historical or political theory, but in the character which he has chosen for himself, as the champion of evil, the apologist of wrong.

#### RENDU ON GLACIERS.\*

THE publication of M. Rendu's work in an English dress will be specially welcomed, apart from its intrinsic interest as a contribution to our knowledge of glaciers, by those who desire to form a clear and impartial judgment upon the priority of claim asserted on his behalf against Principal Forbes in respect to the fundamental theory of glacier formation. Such has been the progress

\* *Theory of the Glaciers of Savoy*. By M. le Chanoine Rendu. Translated by Alfred Wills, Q.C., late President of the Alpine Club. Edited, with Introductory Remarks, by George Forbes, B.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the Andersonian University, Glasgow. London: Macmillan & Co. 1874.

of observation and scientific reasoning during the interval since the Bishop's book first appeared that its value at the present hour must be estimated by an historical rather than a philosophical standard. Still, if no longer new, or even in full keeping with what may be considered the most advanced or authoritative doctrine of glacialists in general, the work speaks well for the natural sagacity and close observation of the writer; and it may well excite surprise that one with so little scientific training, and working in apparent independence of the ordinary adjuncts to observation, should have gained so deep an insight into the phenomena of glacial structure and action, and should have anticipated on so many points the conclusions now adopted by the most competent inquirers. Since the Bishop's death a question has been raised as to the degree in which the facts or speculations originally belonging to him have been made use of by others. It is now more than thirty years since certain allegations of plagiarism or of undue acknowledgment of Rendu's labours were more or less vaguely mooted in scientific circles, the results announced by Principal Forbes having been held by some to have been anticipated by the Bishop, and not to have had justice done to them in the *Travels* in which Forbes put forth his theory in 1843. We need hardly now revive the early history of the controversy which grew out of this allegation, complicated as it was with the further charge that the labours of Agassiz had in like manner been unduly appropriated by Forbes as far back as the year 1841. The leading points at issue were summarily touched upon by us in our notice of the *Life and Letters of Forbes*. Within the twelvemonth that has since elapsed the charge has been taken up anew by Professor Tyndall and rebutted on the side of the late Principal by his son as well as by more than one of his joint biographers. A degree of heat has thus been thrown into the controversy which is on every ground to be deprecated.

The observations of Rendu, for which he had prepared himself by studying all that physicists, naturalists, and travellers had written on the subject, extended over many years, and were carried on at the Glacier des Bois, upon the Mer de Glace of Mont Blanc, at the Glacier des Bossons, and at that of Argentière. Two years after the completion of his essay, when he had almost laid aside the idea of publishing it, he was induced to give it to the world, imperfect as he felt it to be, by seeing the work of M. Ch. Godefroi, the errors of which he held himself bound to point out. Rendu's *Théorie des Glaciers* appeared in Vol. X. of the *Mémoires de l'Académie de Savoie*, 1841. From his earliest journey abroad, in 1826, Forbes had become familiar with the aspect of glaciers, and could hardly have helped forming some idea of their structure and origin before entering upon a course of observations in the company of Agassiz upon the Grimsel on the 8th of August, 1841. It was among the group of scientific men there assembled, as Forbes has since stated and proved by means of letters and other evidence, that he first heard Rendu's work talked of, and that with anything but respect. After leaving the glaciers the same year he mentions having seen the *Théorie* cursorily in the hands of a Swiss friend, when he thought it by no means worthy of the ridicule which he had heard applied to it. Writing to Professor Jameson, on August 22 in the following year, from Zermatt, and expounding the leading features of his theory, he speaks of not having yet been able to procure Rendu's work. It was not till February 1843 that a copy of the book actually reached him from the Bishop himself, to whom after many futile attempts to procure one he had made application by letter.

Strictly speaking then, Professor Tyndall was not incorrect in saying in 1860, and repeating in 1872, that Forbes when he began his observations with Agassiz was acquainted with the labours of Rendu, but he also acknowledged that Forbes needed no such inspiration and would doubtless in any case have grasped the idea of viscosity, executing his measurements and applying his knowledge to maintain it. The Scottish Professor, if he had not been exceptionally jealous where matters touching honour or veracity were concerned, and tenacious of every jot and tittle of professional fame, need hardly have taken such dire offence at words like these. He could have afforded to let the world judge between the crude ideas of Rendu, which he had time to incorporate into the history of preparatory discoveries whilst preparing his own book for the press, and the finished theory worked out by himself and fortified with the varied learning of a trained intellect. He had done ample justice to the Bishop's statement of his views and observations. He spoke of Rendu as the only writer who had insisted on the plasticity of the ice, shown by moulding itself to the endlessly varying form and section of its bed, and as also opposed to his leading contemporaries in his conjecture that the centre of the ice-stream would be found to move fastest. At the same time he quoted the Bishop's candid admission that the manner or cause of motion is utterly unknown ("le mode est entièrement inconnu"). "Peut-être avec de longues observations, des expériences bien faites sur la glace et la neige, viendra-t-on à bout de le saisir; mais ces premiers éléments nous manquent encore." Such words are a sufficient justification of Forbes's statement that the writings of Rendu are as silent as those of Agassiz, Godefroi, and Charpentier as to the real mode and nature of glacier motion. That Rendu was acquainted with the veined or ribboned, or what is now known as the lamellar, structure of glacier ice is a further inference which Forbes in his rejoinder was enabled to repel, showing that what the Bishop's language applied to was the true stratification of the *névé*, not the thin and delicate bands of blue or bluish white traversing the ice in a vertical direction, which he himself, as he says in a letter from the spot to Professor

Jameson, was the first to notice. He made the observation during his first walk with Agassiz, August 9, 1841, and he says he was surprised to find that philosopher declare he had not distinctly noticed before, or at least had considered it as a superficial phenomenon wholly unconnected with the general structure of the ice. Were we engaged upon the issue between Forbes and Agassiz as rival discoverers, we should urge this passage, written at the moment and under the spell of the enthusiasm with which he threw himself under the tuition of Agassiz, as strongly convincing of the priority and independence of a discovery which has been no less hotly called in question than has Forbes's unconsciousness of debt to Rendu.

It is rather curious, considering the way in which the names of Agassiz and Rendu have been coupled together in the course of this controversy, to find that on the occasion referred to by Forbes, when Rendu's work was talked of among the party assembled upon the glacier of the Aar in August 1841, it was spoken of by Agassiz or his friends as that of a visionary. It is scarcely less strange that it should have met with nothing like the curiosity or attention abroad which has attached to it in this country. Rendu's theory of the plasticity or quasi-fluidity of glacier masses, which he compares to a soft paste, seems to have found little favour among foreign glacialists or physical philosophers. So far was it from resting on a basis solid or firm enough for their conviction of its truth, that it could be quoted with approbation by Charpentier, a zealous supporter of the rival theory of dilatation. Now that we have Rendu's essay before us in full we can form a more definite estimate of the significance and value of his speculations. Giving him credit for great sagacity in many of his conjectures, and for many a happy suggestion in advance of his predecessors or contemporaries, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that these qualities fall far short of those of the trained philosopher or man of science. As an amateur, or in the application of a shrewd native judgment and keen powers of observation to the phenomena of nature, Rendu is entitled to much praise. To be raised on high among discoverers of the first class is about the last thing the good Bishop would have sought for himself. This is indeed shown by the terms of his own letter to Forbes, August 17, 1844, in which, so far from betraying the least suspicion that any of his laurels had been appropriated, he writes, "Votre théorie de la marche des glaciers finira par être la seule admise, parcequ'elle est, selon moi, la seule vraie." It would have been easy to set off against Rendu's merits as the originator of much ingenious and well founded speculation the instances of faulty observation or baseless hypothesis which were to be found in his essay. This Forbes has in no case allowed himself to do beyond what he felt to be necessary towards repelling such claims as seemed to him clearly unwarrantable, or such citations as were partially made or strained beyond their actual force. That Rendu was the first to make many observations of great value to glacialists is as much beyond doubt as that he left the determinate proof and ultimate working out of what he observed to reasoners of fuller powers and more scientific training. That the central portions of glaciers move faster than those nearer the sides of their bed seems to have struck no one before him, and he was led by this fact to the idea of their ductility in moulding and adapting themselves to their bed like paste or flowing lava. That the theory had yet by no means taken firm or definite hold of his mind is shown by the remark he made at the same time, that the rigidity of a mass of ice when struck is in direct opposition to his conception, though experiments made on larger masses might, he thought, give other results. The measures of glacier movement given by Rendu are by himself admitted to be but vague and in the highest degree conflicting, being based for the most part upon the dubious reports of guides. One solitary measurement is described as taken by himself upon the Glacier des Bois, where one of two blocks, the position of which he had fixed in 1838, had by the year following advanced four hundred feet, the other having disappeared from sight. His easiness in admitting the loose estimates of guides is shown in his conceiving the central velocity at the Montanvert to be ten times that of the lateral velocity of the ice. In his comparison of the movement of a glacier with that of a river, ingenious as it unquestionably is and expressive of much truth, he had been anticipated by Captain Basil Hall, nor must we forget that what he relies upon for his conviction of this river-like motion is the fallacious notion that the crevasses of a glacier stretch across it in curves convex towards the valley below. What was really wanting was not theory, but proof, nor is it to be gainsaid that before the problem was taken in hand by Forbes no precise or quantitative estimate had been applied to glacier motion, nor had the lamellar structure of the ice on the one hand or its analogy with viscous substances on the other been definitely described or even pointed out. It must be remembered that it is by analogy only, and consequently only so far as the analogy holds good, that a substance like ice, crystalline and brittle, can be compared with viscous or tenacious substances such as wax, which was Forbes's analogue, treacle, or glue, which Mr. Ruskin prefers in the trenchant extract from *Fora Clavigera* which winds up the publication before us, or the "soft paste" of M. Rendu himself. As Mr. Ruskin pithily puts it, a cartload of fresh-caught herring is liquid, though a single herring is not; and so may the mass of glacier-ice be at once viscous or semi-fluid, though an individual piece of ice is brittle and readily split. After all, observations like these, while setting before the mind the reality or the mode of glacier motion, require for their complement



and explanation a reference to some higher law, whether the mode of causation be sought for in the theory of regulation as proposed by Faraday and expounded by Tyndall, or in that of transmission by alternate heat and cold as more recently propounded by Mr. Croll, whom Mr. James Geikie is inclined to follow. From the first loose and hazardous guess of an acute but untrained mind to the final proof wrought by the joint forces of genius and scientific discipline to a point of demonstration as near that of mathematics as is possible under the conditions of observed truth, there is of necessity an interval more or less vague, and it can hardly be possible for the merits of each worker to be measured with a degree of precision in which all will agree. It is, however, the interest of all that candour and good sense should control the judgment, and that an even and kindly temper should be maintained throughout the discussion. As far as facts are to be ascertained there can be no gain from prosecuting any further the controversy we have had under our notice, and we would fain see it brought to an end by a friendly shaking of hands between the partisans of Forbes and Rendu.

#### YOUNG BROWN.\*

IT is perhaps somewhat surprising that the sensational novel has not long since died a natural death. The improbability of incident, the unnatural dialogue, the ludicrous mistakes as to the practices of society, the utter ignorance of legal and other professional knowledge which mark the vulgar type of these productions have been repeatedly exposed. But, apart altogether from critical condemnation, it might have been supposed that the competition in absurdity and extravagance in which this school of fiction indulges would of itself lead in time to a process of exhaustion. The pace seemed to be too severe to last. Every new novel in this style was bound to be more thrilling than its predecessor, and there was consequently the prospect that a point must some day be reached beyond which fantastic nonsense could no further go. If this climax has not been reached before, it has been reached now. Whether *Young Brown* is meant seriously or as a joke, it is certainly the wildest and most preposterous picture of life which has yet been produced. So much so, indeed, is this the case that we can hardly help thinking that its purpose must really be satirical; and, as an enemy of the sensational novel, we are therefore disposed to welcome in the author of *Young Brown* an ally in a new and unexpected form. The idea of holding up novelists to ridicule by caricaturing their wilder passages is not indeed wholly original. Readers of Thackeray will remember his admirable parodies on Bulwer, James, and other popular writers of fifteen years since, who had struck out special lines of their own; and Bret Harte's rougher American humour has lately been turned into a similar channel. But the authors whom these humourists have amused us by caricaturing were at least men of some real gifts and power. It has been reserved for the author of *Young Brown* to apply his satirical faculty to the ordinary hack manufacturers of three-volume novels, and especially those who cater for the lovers of pure sensationalism. It is certainly the simplest explanation of his extraordinary plot that it is, from first to last, a burlesque of a well-known class of novels. No one seriously intending to write a story would select such incidents as are here strung together as the framework of the wildest romance. Seduction, bigamy, violence, the unpleasant juxtaposition of characters who are closely related, but without their knowledge—these are too common elements in the ordinary sensational romance to strike one as extraordinary here but for the special touches of exaggeration which make this story the satire which we have assumed it to be. Peers doing the meanest and most felonious actions with the most courtly of airs, and gaining thereby the smallest possible advantages at the highest conceivable risks—these are staple articles of the stock-in-trade of writers in three volumes. But caricature must go beyond this, and our author achieves his object by making his villainous nobles more rascally, and their criminalities meaner and more felonious, than any novelist has hitherto dared. He takes care also to keep as far as possible in the highest ranks of the peerage; and generally his other improbabilities and blunders are a shade more glaring and outrageous than those of the class of writers whom he has undertaken to outdo on their own ground.

The chief character of the novel is a Duke, who always goes about with a double title so firmly fastened to him as not to be dropped for a moment; so that, if he visits his mistress daily, the three footmen in attendance bawl out, each in his separate sphere on stairs or landing, "His Grace the Duke of Courthope and Revel." Real dukes, as the author no doubt well knows, are not thus burdened in real life; but this fact is hid from the knowledge of the average sensational novelist, who probably takes his view of the peerage direct from a shilling handbook, and makes other curious blunders in consequence, such as supposing that our ancient peerages have James's favourite title of baronet tacked on to them, a mistake which our satirist happily holds up to special notice by repeating it in his pages in more than one passage. This Duke, belated from the hunt, has to pass a night at a village inn. Here he meets with a pretty and hitherto virtuous maid, the result being her hasty marriage with a hitherto rejected clown of a

suitors, whom she, soon after their marriage, presents with a son, the Young Brown of the story. No suspicion is raised in the worthy husband's mind, though his instinct of jealousy is of such an intense nature when roused that he would have killed her on the discovery, more than twenty years afterwards, of a ten-pound note given her by her seducer, but for the intervention of a benevolent clergyman, the *Deus ex machina* of the romance. There are many striking circumstances connected with this brief ducal visit, the most important being that the mother of Young Brown was in reality the legitimate daughter of the former Duke; an unpleasant circumstance in any case, but not so painful as it at first seems, for we afterwards learn that this deceased peer was not really the father, but the uncle of his successor, who was taken over by the late Duchess from his birth to save the honour of a sister-in-law. The private history of our peerage no doubt, at least as represented in modern novels, abounds with such incidents; but we do not remember any special justification for the singular mystery in which our author has enveloped this part of his plot, and which compels him to explain in a long-winded preface, for the benefit of his readers, that Margaret Brown was not, as some have wrongly supposed from his text as it appeared in a magazine, her seducer's half-sister. The substitution of the Duke for a son proper of his father happily prevents this misfortune, but it also obviously defrauds the rightful heir of the dukedom, Lord George Wyldwyl, of his rights. Hence no doubt the second name given to the romance. This true nobleman of nature, who is represented throughout as a pattern of integrity, generosity, and courage, connives at the fraud for the sake of the family honour, and thenceforward spends his life as a soldier in India, on pay, as we are told, of seldom less than about ten thousand a year. This arrangement enables the author, as we shall presently see, to deal as happily with that country and the writers on it as with the novelists whom he is laughing at in his fashionable English scenes. The Duke's later career fills more of the work than Young Brown's, and the characteristic way in which such a personage is sure to be treated in the hands of a sensational novelist is drolly, though extravagantly, imitated. His grace commits forgery, cheats his son of his entail in order to buy more land, and all the time moves in the highest society where he rules ministers, bishops, and members of Parliament with an all-pervading influence which no one can resist. Next to the Duke, the most important character is a Mr. Sharpe, also no doubt a portrait from the novelist's real life, who combines all the arts of a Yorkshire horse-coper with those of a keen moneylender and of a solicitor in first-rate practice, and who alternately bullies the Duke by telling him that he is about to "take him down a peg," or trembles at his superior rascality.

Meanwhile Young Brown starts for India as a private of Lancers, and the author commences a series of rhapsodies on our misgovernment of that country, which even those novelists whom he is evidently mocking would hardly have dared to heap into a single chapter. Indeed, though they may have made serious errors, it is hard to find a fair precedent among them for such a statement as that "twenty-six thousand persons were massacred at Cabul in 1841 with the sanction of the Foreign Office and Board of Control the next time the Sepoys showed their teeth"—the previous occasion being the Mutiny at Vellore. It is generally thought that the brigade lost by us in Afghanistan was in the main composed of Sepoys, and that they were killed by Afghans in open war. But then we must remember that we are here perhaps dealing with a satirist, and not with an ordinary novelist. Hence it is too, no doubt, that we are told that England never sent out a man of real note, who had a character and future at home, to govern our dependency. Your ordinary novelist would probably ignore Cornwallis, Wellesley, Bentinck, Dalhousie, and Canning; and his facetious imitator could do no less. Our readers will have guessed that Young Brown is to serve in the Mutiny, and such is indeed the course of the tale. Nor do *Gulliver's Travels* contain more remarkable episodes than this young gentleman goes through, though our author is hardly to be compared with Swift, except indeed in the singleness of his object. When we say that Young Brown's regiment sailed to relieve India in "an expedition" commanded by a general; that the ship touched at Aden for mules, thus anticipating by fifteen years or so M. Lesseps's Canal project; that Nana Sahib prepared the mutiny at Meerut, whence the revolted cavalry rode straight to join him; that, to save the trouble of keeping prisoners in the campaign that followed, "thousands of these dusky-skinned Indians were sent daily and hourly into eternity without any fuss or outcry"; that "Our Own Correspondent kept enterprisingly out of the way" all this time; that, in the defeat of Nana Sahib, the order which forced the cavalry into deciding the action is copied verbatim from that which Nolan bore at Balaklava; and that, finally, when there is a difficulty about the Commander-in-Chief getting a well-earned commission for Young Brown, a private interview at Calcutta between a Scotch contractor and the obstinate Adjutant-General produces a "despatch" bearing the required honour the next day—every one who has any acquaintance with military affairs will appreciate the truth and delicacy of the touches. Not less happy is the author as to other professions. His benevolent clergyman, for instance, though in charge of a sequestered living, is represented as dependent for his curate's pittance on the imprisoned rector, whom he usually speaks of as "his patron"; whilst the Duke of Courthope, who commands three bishops and their votes in the Lords, has the somewhat unconstitutional power of ordering any one of them to "muzzle" any particular clergyman in any part of England

\* *Young Brown*; or, the *Law of Inheritance*. By the Author of the "Monger for Paris," "Men of the Second Empire," &c. 3 vols. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1874.

whose evidence might be inconvenient to his Grace. Again, a police magistrate is made to take counsel privately in his own room with an attorney who is about to be called as a witness. Greatest of all, perhaps, is this writer in his love affairs; for does not the very Commander-in-Chief, whose Adjutant-General caused him to object officially to commissioning Sergeant Brown as "confounding the distinctions of rank," only a few months later throw his only daughter, a lovely creature, the true heiress of the family mansion of the wicked Duke, at the head of Cornet or Captain Brown—whose various ranks in the last chapters are a little confused—when that fine young fellow is too modest to ask for her?

It is difficult to describe the general tone and spirit of the book, which is full of sneering and snarling from beginning to end, but perhaps "ill-conditioned" is the word that comes nearest to the mark. Everybody in authority is represented as either imbecile or corrupt, or more usually both, and rank and reputation as only a useful cover for debauchery and crime. We admit that there cannot be a more proper subject of satire than the state of mind which finds the whole world, or at least all the middle and upper classes of society, gangrened with vice, roguery, and humbug. It is possible that, besides the ordinary sensational novel, the author of *Young Brown* may also have had in view the sort of literature which was represented a year or two since by the scandalous *Queen's Messenger*, and more recently by the *Chesterfield Letters*. One of the chief themes of this work is the existence of a sort of Vehmgericht of chief clerks of public offices, and there is something very curious in the writer's assumption of a sort of personal spite against the forms of criminal justice.

#### THE SEVEN AGES OF A VILLAGE PAUPER.\*

THIS little book is written in an excellent spirit and for a praiseworthy object. It may remind its readers in some ways of *Ginx's Baby*, but the differences are more prominent than the resemblances. Mr. Bartley does not show much of the literary skill of his predecessor, and it is not to be expected that his book will make anything to be called a sensation. He gives the plain unvarnished facts of a poor man's life, and has no disposition to make the shades of the picture blacker than they naturally are. On the other hand, if the book is less startling, its moral is very superior. The readers of *Ginx's Baby* derived from its perusal a vague impression that society was somehow fundamentally wrong, and that somebody ought to be hanged if every Ginx in the land was not enabled to give comfortable portions to as many young Ginxes as he chose to bring into the world. Any reference to political economy was implicitly denounced as implying a hard heart and a cynical indifference to the welfare of the poor. Mr. Bartley understands much better what he is about. He assigns a definite cause for the evils which he describes, and suggests a distinct remedy. Without asking whether the cause or the remedy is adequate, we may at least admit that he has made a useful contribution to a very important subject, and that a study of his book raises some definite issues.

The plan of the book is simple. Mr. Bartley was accidentally led to take lodgings in a village within twenty-four miles of London, but lying in a specially out-of-the-way corner. The population of the parish is 1,456, and the inhabitants are almost exclusively engaged in agriculture. Mr. Bartley endeavours to describe as accurately as he can the general conditions of their lives, which may be taken as representing the average state of similarly situated districts. The house accommodation, he says, is very superior to that of most London districts. Farm wages are from 12s. to 16s. per week, though they have lately risen. Mechanics earn a pound or 25s., and brickmakers receive 30s. a week during summer. There is a church with a very good clergyman, a respectable school, and, what Mr. Bartley considers to be a great advantage, no charitable endowments. There is, however, one great evil which meets Mr. Bartley in all his inquiries, and which seems to him to lie at the root of almost all that is objectionable. This evil is not the public-house, though there are a good many more of them than is desirable, but the parish. In short, Mr. Bartley thinks, and endeavours to prove by a number of minute details, that the Poor-law is the great demoralizing influence of the country. In this doctrine of course there is nothing new. A hundred and fifty years ago De Foe explained it very forcibly in his *Giving Alms No Charity*; it has been expounded by any number of political economists since his time, and been embodied in a good deal of legislation. Mr. Bartley's peculiarity is merely that he endeavours to trace out minutely the precise mode by which the Poor-law discourages thrift; and that he has a remedy of his own to propose. According to him the number of persons relieved in the half-year to Lady-day 1873 amounted to 133, or rather more than one in eleven of the population; and he infers, with what accuracy we cannot say, that three-fourths of the whole number would expect to receive relief at one time or other. Moreover, Mr. Bartley holds that the pauperism which infects so large a proportion of the lowest class is gradually spreading upwards, and quotes in defence of his position the number of children of the middle classes who are now provided for by the various charitable institutions. Perhaps in this Mr. Bartley is rather travelling beyond his proper limits; he has quite enough to do in pointing out the evil influence of the Poor-law without undertaking a Quixotic crusade

against the huge apparatus which is always at work for demoralizing the people of England. If he were to take into account the innumerable influences which tend in one way or another to diminish the spirit of self-reliance amongst different classes, he would have to compile a series of Blue-books instead of a single volume. For the most part, indeed, he confines himself pretty strictly to his point; and his point is that whereas, according to the proper theory of a Poor-law, none should be relieved but the destitute, the practical result is that all become destitute in order to obtain relief. This is the moral drawn in the chapter which describes the entrance of the pauper into the world. He gives us three typical cases. The doctor's fee for attendance on these occasions is a pound, which is a serious sum for a poor family. One woman who applies for relief upon the expected event is refused on the ground that she has only three children. Another is refused because her husband makes 30s. a week in the summer, though in the winter his wages are reduced to half that sum. The third, whose husband makes only 14s. a week, gets an order; the doctor and nurse are paid by the parish, and she gets whatever supplies may be necessary in the shape of food. The moral which is naturally deduced from these facts by the poor is, in the first place, that they ought to have large families; secondly, that it is folly to save money in clubs, because the parish is bound to supply their wants in case of need; and, thirdly, that it is merely a point of good policy to make themselves out as poor as possible, and if by any accident they have saved any small sum of money, to conceal the fact as though it were a crime. The notion that there is anything disgraceful in receiving parish relief gradually goes out of fashion, and every kind of deception is regarded as pardonable when it is employed for the purpose of extorting money from that abstraction the parish. All manner of evil consequences follow. Mr. Bartley, for example, tells a story by way of illustrating the systematic trickery which is naturally encouraged. A lady was visiting a poor woman who declared that she had not been able to taste meat for a long time. At this moment the lady's dog smelling about the cottage pulled a large piece of meat out of a basket; and the woman looking a little awkward, explained that it had just been brought by the relieving-officer and that she had forgotten it. All the children, he says, were too well trained in deception not to fall in immediately with the fiction invented by their mother. He tells us again various stories equally significant, and unfortunately equally commonplace, of the calmness with which children who may happen to be well off refuse to help their parents because they feel that they would only be taking a burden off the parish, and of the universal expectation, even of the more industrious and independent poor, that they will have to be supported from the rates in their old age.

There is nothing about such anecdotes which is not perfectly familiar to any one who has the most superficial knowledge of the general state of the case. Mr. Bartley has simply brought them together with a view of calling attention to the necessity of some improved system. The obvious moral is that all Poor Law relief, and indeed all charity, must be more or less demoralizing. In so far as you help anybody in distress, you prevent him from helping himself or from making preparations beforehand. Mr. Bartley, however, admits, what indeed does not admit of dispute, that we have practically no choice as to giving such relief. We must retain the principle that nobody is to be allowed to starve. But, allowing this, is it possible to arrange a system which shall not be a positive discouragement to thrift? Mr. Bartley replies that it may be done by making thrift a condition of outdoor relief. We are not absolutely to decline to help the poor, but are to say that they must come into the workhouse unless they can show that they have in some way or other saved money. At present a poor man who has saved an annuity will have a deduction made in consequence from the sum allowed him by the parish, and it is therefore obviously his interest not to save. He is, in fact, not saving for himself, but saving the rates. Mr. Bartley would adopt the opposite policy, and add something to the savings of such a man by way of reward. The principle may very probably be a good one, and certainly deserves discussion. We have however some doubt whether that or any other legislative change can really strike at the root of so deeply-seated a mischief. We do not doubt that outdoor relief is liable to great abuse, and that a more strict adherence to the workhouse test would be frequently most desirable. On the other hand, it has often been pointed out that to force poor people into the workhouse may frequently have a most demoralizing effect when some timely help might have enabled them to tide over a difficulty. There is a balance of evils upon which practical experience must decide, but the proposal that saving should give a man a right to stay outside the workhouse is one which doubtless deserves consideration. The further plan, which, if we rightly understand it, is that a poor man's savings should be increased by the parish, strikes us as more doubtful. It is most desirable that the poor should have every facility for saving small sums, but the system of encouragement by bonus would lead to some complicated questions. If a man has saved enough to support himself in comfort, it can scarcely be asked that the parish should add to his means. Some very moderate amount of savings must in any case operate as a bar to receiving money from the parish; and thus, if the parish does not discourage saving absolutely, it must discourage saving beyond a certain amount. The objection, indeed, cannot be entirely avoided by any system of relief. According to Mr. Bartley's plan, again, it would seem to be worth while for a poor man to run in debt in order to establish a fictitious saving, which the parish would then be called upon to

\* *The Seven Ages of a Village Pauper*. By G. C. T. Bartley. London: Chapman & Hall. 1874.



double. A door would be open for all manner of evasions and deceptions of a different kind from those now existing, but still mischievous. We do not say that it is impossible to devise a scheme which shall not be free from such objections; but it would require a great deal of care and discussion. Indeed, greater individual discretion seems to be more needed than any change upon paper, however ingenious. It is, however, desirable that such proposals should receive a fuller examination than we can now give them, and Mr. Bartley will do good service if he can force them upon public attention.

#### JOAN OF ARC AND THE TIMES OF CHARLES VII.\*

IN her present work Mrs. Bray's aim has been to give a vivid and picturesque sketch of the reign of Charles VII. of France, with Joan of Arc, the most striking personage of the period, for the central figure. That "young and interesting female," as Lingard, with a singular want of perception of the ridiculous, styles the Maid of Orleans, still remains, despite all that has been written to elucidate her marvellous career, one of the most remarkable and mysterious of historical phenomena. Our author does not profess to contribute any new facts to the biography, nor has she any new views upon the real or supposed mission of her heroine, the details of whose trial she is content to learn at second-hand from Barante and Martin. On the question of Joan's mission, indeed, Mrs. Bray seems not to have made up her mind, or rather to be in different minds at different times. In the beginning of her work, adopting a rationalistic interpretation, she holds that Joan, by dint of long religious ecstasies, worked herself into a state of enthusiasm in which she took her fancies for realities, and that "she wished to be the woman to deliver France, till at last she believed that she was appointed by God to fulfil the prophecy which expressed His will." But by the time the author has conducted her heroine to triumph and to martyrdom she has waxed warmer in her behalf, and advances for her, albeit timidly, claims to divine inspiration. "It is possible," says Mrs. Bray, whose former studies have made her familiar with strange forms of religious enthusiasm, "she might have been under the influence of that kind of hallucination which, since her day, has been so common in the Cévennes; but even if we allow this, it will not account for what she accomplished"; and after recapitulating the marvels of Joan's career, she concludes:—"If in some mysterious manner, beyond the power of reason, yet not contrary to it, God was pleased to make known His purpose to the simple and humble creature He chose to bring it to pass, who shall gainsay it?" Either of these theories—that Joan was deluded, or that she was sent of God—is tenable, but hardly both at once. On the question of the supernatural, we will only remark that the temptation to believe in the heroine's divine mission lies, we suspect, not so much in the wondrous things she performed—which, after all, may be explained by the almost boundless power of religious and patriotic fervour, working upon an impassioned and hysterical temperament, and the contagious nature alike of enthusiasm and panic—as in the natural reluctance to admit that so noble a work could have been the result of mental disease. It must be owned that Joan of Arc—must we consent to call her by the less euphonious name of Joan Darc?—is of all recorded visionaries the least morbid, the most vigorous and natural; displaying little or nothing of the restless self-consciousness and vanity that might be looked for in one who thought herself highly favoured by Heaven. "You may touch them yourself," she said, laughing, to her hostess Margaret La Touroude, when women brought rosaries to receive the holy touch of the Maid, "for they will be as good for your touching as for mine." When, as the same witness testifies, a belief was expressed that the heroine's fearlessness sprang from her certain knowledge that she could not be slain, the Maid replied that she had no greater security than the other men-at-arms. When questioned on her trial about the dead infant whom her prayers were said to have resuscitated to receive the rite of baptism, she tells the story with perfect simplicity; she joined the maidens of the town in praying for him; she does not give any opinion as to whether the event was miraculous or not, nor does she take the credit of it to herself.

The peculiar combination in her of simplicity and shrewdness, of fire and gentleness, of the peasant-girl with the mystic and the saint, altogether so little like the character which a writer forming an inspired heroine out of his inner consciousness would probably portray, has often been remarked upon. In the girl who to his face threatened Dunois that she would have his head cut off if he failed to inform her of the enemy's approach, who broke her sword over the shoulders of a courtesan, whose fearless speech in captivity and on trial is recorded to have provoked Lord Stafford to draw his dagger on her, and to have extorted from a more generous foe the admiring exclamation, "Truly she is a good woman—would that she were English!" who knew how to put down a captious questioner with rough and ready repartee, as when Brother Seguin asked in his Limousin patois, "In what dialect did the voice speak to you?" and got for an answer, "In a better dialect than yours"—in such stories as these we can trace something which might be exaggerated into

the termagant sorceress of English slander, the "femme très cruelle" of the Bourgeois of Paris, the "railing Hecate" of Shakspeare's *Henry VI.* Yet with all her martial energy, she shrank from taking life with her own hand, and there was no lack of tenderness or pity in her when in the hour of victory she mourned for the foes who had died unshriven, or when, as her page Louis de Contes records, she dismounted to succour the English prisoner whom she had seen savagely struck down by his French captor. Deep and enthusiastic as her religious feelings were, she was not of the commonplace saintly type, for her character was antagonistic to that "otherworldliness" which with hagiologists often passes as the supreme virtue. Her leading idea was to save her country and her King, not to win for herself a high place in Paradise. She was pure and abstemious, and fasted on all proper occasions; but she made no boast of asceticism, and her enemies were able to reproach her with her gay and fashionable attire, such as, according to the act of accusation, "homines dissolutissimi" alone would wear. Had she been the kind of saint that priests favour, she would have been a more useful tool, and might have made friends who would not have abandoned her in her need; but she would never have played so noble a part in the history of her land. Upon women she generally seems to have produced a favourable impression, and this in itself is high testimony to the truth of her character. Women would assuredly have been keen to mark and to criticize any weakness or hypocrisy in one who had thrown conventional rules of conduct so far aside. We see how quick Joan herself was in suspecting and denouncing her feeble rival or coadjutor, Katharine of La Rochelle. Mrs. Bray, in her brief mention of this curious incident, does justice to the "natural shrewdness" which led Joan to detect the hollowness of Katharine's claims to inspiration, and to the honesty which kept her from being a tool in the hands of Katharine's patron Brother Richard, who had evidently hoped for the Maid's co-operation. But there is one remarkable point upon which the author does not touch—that Joan sought counsel of her heavenly guides, St. Margaret and St. Katharine, and professed to have learnt from them that "du fait de icelle Katharine n'estoit que folie, et estoit tout nient." Joan's revelations in this, as in other matters, were plainly only the echo of her own thoughts, and it is curious to see the genuine visionary appealing to the creatures of her imagination in order to quash the pretensions of the false one.

Mrs. Bray is inexact in her account of two of the incidents to which we have referred. She attributes to two different persons the inquiry about the dialect in which the voice spoke, and the succeeding question, "Si crederet in Deum," to which Joan answered with a similar retort, "Yes, better than you." They were both put by Seguin, who told the story himself in his deposition in the *procès de réhabilitation*. In the account of what passed between Joan and Lord Stafford, the author makes the English Earl tell the captive that she was about to be put to ransom on condition of never taking up arms against the English party again—a statement which Joan received as a piece of mockery. In reality it was John of Luxemburg who made the offer of ransom, and the Maid's answer, "In the name of God, you mock me, for I know well that you have neither the will nor the power," may have conveyed a reproach to him for having sold her to the English. On his repetition of the offer she broke out into that fierce speech against "ces Angloys" which so exasperated Stafford that the Earl of Warwick had to prevent him from striking her. Mrs. Bray elsewhere styles this same Warwick "the Kingmaker," thus confounding Richard Beauchamp with his more famous son-in-law Richard Neville. The printer, we suppose, must be answerable for "Stephen Vignolles and that strange Gascon commonly called La Hire," as we can hardly doubt that the author knows Stephen de Vignolles and La Hire to be one and the same man. Again, on the subject of the trial of the Maid, Mrs. Bray is not accurate in saying that the University of Paris "addressed the Council of King Henry, begging that Bishop Cauchon might be compelled to make more haste in getting up the evidence and the preliminaries of the charges under his direction." To Henry they only complained generally of the delay in putting the woman into the hands of justice, without at all implying that Cauchon was to blame for it. The description of the actual trial seizes on the most striking and dramatic features, but the order of events is not always strictly preserved, as in the following speech, represented to have been made by Joan on the 24th of February:—

The voice spoke to me three times yesterday; it speaks to me here in this court. It says, "Reply boldly; be not afraid. God will aid you." The voice speaks to me in my prison; if it did not comfort me there, I should not now be alive. Yet I cannot always hear what it says, for the noise of the prison and of the guards. Ah! I should hear it well if I were in some forest.

The first two sentences are partly taken from Joan's answers on the 24th of February. The statement that she should be dead, were it not for the revelation which comforted her daily, was made on the 1st of March. Her complaint that she could not always understand what St. Katharine said to her—"propter turbationem carcerum et per tumultus custodum suorum"—was made on the 14th of the same month, when she was examined in prison. Her curious statement that "si ipse esset in uno nemore, bene audiret voces venientes ad eam," was made on the second day of her examination, February 22nd, when she gave her account of the first revelations vouchsafed to her. Mrs. Bray has also misapprehended one of the questions put to the accused on the subject of the mysterious sign given to Charles. After Joan had at last answered with a strange story about an

\* *Joan of Arc and the Times of Charles VII., King of France.* By Mrs. Bray, Author of "The Good St. Louis," "The Revolt of the Protestants of the Cévennes," "The White Hoods," "Hartland Forest," "Life of Stothard," &c. London: Griffith & Farran. 1874.

angel and a crown, Cauchon, according to our author, appearing not to comprehend "poor Jeanne's allegory"—for which we think he might be excused—"gravely asked her 'whether the angel who brought the crown was of heaven or of earth.'" The inquiry really was whether the angel "venoit de hault, ou s'il venoit par terre"—whether he came down from heaven, or along the ground—and Joan, in her subsequent answers, accordingly described the manner of his entry.

We note also an unjust accusation against the States-General which met at Chinon in 1428, at the time when the English were advancing upon Orleans. "The sum they voted," says Mrs. Bray, "was so small, that it showed an almost incredible indifference, both to the imminent danger of the time and to the necessities of the King." The sum, which she does not specify, was 400,000 livres, payable by classes usually exempt; and this was the contribution of a well-nigh ruined people, who had been long engaged in an almost desperate struggle. M. Picot, whose laborious work upon the States-General was reviewed some time back in these columns, remarks that scant justice has been done to the patriotism of those who voted and paid the taxes to support the cause of Charles VII. and of France; and it is certainly not to Mrs. Bray that they can look for their due meed of praise. On the other hand, she attributes to the leaders of the combined English and Burgundian force which won the battle of Crevant a chivalry for which we are not inclined to give them credit. Among the resolutions come to by the allied leaders at their conference in the Cathedral Church of Auxerre—not, as Mrs. Bray says, before their assembly there—was one prohibiting the making of prisoners until the battle was gained, under penalty of death to the captor, and also to the captive, if he resisted. The object of the prohibition, according to our author, was "to control the thirst for plundering the fallen by the demand of unreasonable ransoms." In the first place, we doubt whether those who issued the orders were likely to concern themselves about the protection of the defeated against unreasonable demands; in the next place, although the order, if obeyed, would effectually deliver many men from any demands, reasonable or unreasonable, and indeed from all other troubles in this world, it would not prevent the most exorbitant ransoms being extorted from the prisoners who might be made at the end of the day. The real objects of the prohibition are plain enough. It would guard against a dangerous number of prisoners being accumulated while the issue of the fight was still uncertain. Every one knows how this was thought to be the case at Agincourt, and how Henry V. hastily gave the command for a general butchery:—

The French have reinforced their scattered men:—  
Then every soldier kill his prisoners;  
Give the word through.

Besides this, it would also prevent the soldiers from wasting their time in looking after their prisoners while the battle was still to be won. The minutes that Ancient Pistol—again to turn to Shakespeare for an illustration—spent at Agincourt in threatening and hectoring the frightened Monsieur Le Fer into the payment of "egregious ransom" might have served for the defeat and slaughter of a legion of Le Fers. The fact that the prisoner taken against orders was to be put to death shows how little his interests were considered in the matter; he was simply a valuable piece of property. Neither was it, as Mrs. Bray represents, commanded that "all who attended should, on pain of death, leave their horses half a league distant from the church." The order, as may be seen in Monstrelet, was that the men should dismount for action, and that the horses should then be led half a league to the rear. Mrs. Bray, on the authority of *England and France under the House of Lancaster*, supposes that this was to keep the men from running away. It is not likely that the army started on its march to victory in such a "demoralized" state of mind. The provision was no doubt directed against the reluctance to fight on foot so often displayed by the Continental men-at-arms; and the possible refusals to dismount which the leaders contemplated would be dictated by a rebellious, not a cowardly, spirit.

In her preface Mrs. Bray informs us that the subject of her work "was suggested by the study of the French chroniclers of the fifteenth century," who, as she condescendingly observes, "are singularly rich in original matter." But, while admitting that the fifteenth-century men had good materials, she seems to be of opinion that they did not know how to dress them up, and so "their quaint style, their obsolete language, and their tedious repetitions, repel the modern reader, who requires to be allured and stimulated by composition of a more rapid and lively character." In this mind Mrs. Bray sets herself to supply the defects of "these old writers," and to provide the modern reader with something better suited to his taste. Accordingly this is the way in which she tells the death of Charles VI.:—

The lingering light was fast declining, when the great bell of Notre Dame was heard to

"Toll, toll through the silence of evening."

Those who were in the streets stopped, inquired, and looked anxiously at each other. It was the soul bell, calling on all to pray for a departing spirit.

The bell of Notre Dame tolled but for the mighty dying, or the mighty dead. For whom then now? Soon a solemn strain arose within the walls of the sacred edifice. It had a melancholy cadence—it was a requiem chant. Charles VI. was dead.

That unfortunate King was released from the bondage of mortality and all its afflictions, and from the sorrows of a darkened mind.

"Lord! in thine own good time Thou mad'st his darkness light."

The trial of Gilles Laval de Retz affords an opportunity for fine

writing, of which the author does not fail to take advantage; and she describes the behaviour of the audience, their whispers, and shudders, and hushes of expectation, and suspensions of breath, and even the grating of the hinges of the prison door, in the manner of an historical novelist. These and similar passages suggest the reflection that it would be well if Mrs. Bray had acquired rather more of the sober style of the old writers whom she treats in such a patronizing fashion. She aims too obviously at being pretty and picturesque, while she is often careless as to construction and wanting in clearness.

#### WALDFRIED.\*

HERR AUERBACH'S last book is likely to be a disappointment to his admirers. They will find it difficult to agree with the opinion quoted from a German paper which has been published along with the advertisements of the book, that *Waldfried* is the best of this author's works, and, if our memory serves us right, "that it lays bare the beauties of the poet's heart to the world." Allowing for the inevitable loss incurred by translation, which would seem to be unusually great in the case of *Waldfried*, the fact remains that this romance contains far less of the poetical faculty than one has a right to expect from the author of *On the Heights*. That was a romance of pure fiction which was remarkable for the beauty of the descriptions and the subtle analyses of varied character which it contained; the imagination which there found free play is narrowed by the prosaic reality of the events handled in *Waldfried*. Herein probably is to be found the explanation of the extravagant praise given to the book by the German paper already quoted. One can forgive a German critic for being biased by patriotism in discussing a book which is devoted to the glorification of the United Fatherland. And when such a book is produced by such a writer as Herr Auerbach, it is easy enough to lose sight of its faults. As a question of art, however, there is little doubt that a political novel is a dangerous experiment. The most successful experiments of these days in that direction have been made by Mr. Disraeli and the late Lord Lytton. There are some curious outward points of resemblance between the *Parisians*, Lord Lytton's latest work, and *Waldfried*. It would probably be difficult to point to two great novelists of the same period more utterly unlike, both in mind and manner, than Lord Lytton and Herr Auerbach. It is perhaps therefore the more interesting to compare the different ways in which they treat the same set of events. The Franco-Prussian War and the years preceding it occupy a large portion of both the novels which we have mentioned. Lord Lytton brings to bear upon the subject the keen perception, the brilliant satire, and the bright fancy which he possessed in so marked a degree. The German author approaches it with a soundness and a solidity which would be of great value in a treatise, but approach dangerously near to dullness in a novel. The prominent quality of the one work is imagination, of the other reflection. It is in accordance with the prevailing ideas of German literature entertained in England that a certain heaviness of handling should be acceptable to German readers. That this estimate of the powers of German writers of romance is an unfair one can be proved by reference to many of their works, and amongst others to Herr Auerbach's own earlier productions. On the other hand an examination of the latter will disclose a latent capacity for dullness which seems to have been cultivated in *Waldfried*.

Another point of resemblance between this book and the *Parisians* lies in the vast number of characters contained in each. In the English novel, however, this multiplicity engendered no confusion; a due importance was assigned to each individual; there was a sense of dramatic fitness in the introduction and in the disappearance of every personage. The canvas never appeared to be overcrowded with figures. In *Waldfried* many of the persons who are described seem to demand some better reason than is given for their description. The family alone of Waldfried, the narrator of the book, spreads in so many directions, shoots into so many branches, that it would be impossible for a reader to preserve a clear notion of the identity of each one and its exact connexion with the others unless he had a genealogical tree at hand for the purpose of reference. The difficulty of retaining a precise recollection of all the characters who move through these three volumes is increased by the length of time over which the book extends. There are many characters unconnected by family ties with Waldfried himself whose existence has no influence upon the action of the narrative. It is true that the presence of superfluous and unimportant persons is frequent enough in real life; but this is an accident of real life which the novelist would do better to avoid. Herr Auerbach is a writer of sufficient strength to command attention even to the dull passages of his books, and this makes their dullness the less easy to bear. He compels the reader to distribute over subordinate parts of the work the interest which should be concentrated upon important objects.

The writer has drawn Waldfried, who is the most important object in the novel, as a man with whom it is not easy to sympathize. He is a type of that soundness which is very admirable in the German character, but which is apt also to be very irritating. It is difficult to define exactly the quality of which we are speaking; for want of a better term we have heard it described as "good-

\* *Waldfried*. By Berthold Auerbach, Author of "On the Heights," &c. 3 vols. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1874.



boyism." Waldfried is aggravatingly good and reasonable upon all occasions. The deepest sorrows, the most violent passions, do not ruffle his respectable virtue. Whatever grief or misfortune assails him, it finds him always ready to say and do the most correct and proper thing. If the world were to fall shattered on him, the ruins would strike him not only "impavidum," but fully prepared to moralize upon the unexpected event. On one occasion, shortly after the death of his wife, overcome by grief, he wanders out and is caught in a storm:—

Like a child I began to count the number of seconds between the flashes of lightning and the claps of thunder. At first I counted thirty-two; at length the number had diminished to seven, after which I did not count any more. I saw houses all along the road. I knew the inmates, and could have readily found shelter; but why should I go into anybody's house, wet through as I was already. I kept on over the rough stones in the middle of the road; the rain had so swollen the streams that, as I crossed a little bridge, I was actually wading through the water. The storm-cloud had broken right over my head.

I could not help thinking what a happy fate it would be if the lightning should strike me dead. To die thus would be a blissful lot. But the thought of my children recalled me. "My children, my children," I shrieked, while the thunder drowned my cry. And then the lightning came so vividly and frequently that I was blinded, and able to see nothing. I closed my eyes and clung firmly to a rock. Ever and again, as the flashes of the lightning quivered in unceasing glare, the thunder crashed and boomed with redoubled fury. As I stood thus alone, I thought of the many others who were exposed like I was to the raging storm; and at length I wept, for the first time since her death, I wept. The hail beat vehemently against my face, down which my tears were falling; but I was relieved. Never before had I realized what life and what is death as in that one hour.

In the midst of the raging tumult I heard some one call my name. It was Rothfuss. Coming up to me, he said, "Thank God, there is a warm bed for you at home. Martella made me come and look for you."

He led me home. Everybody apprehended the most serious consequences from the shock I had sustained, but the result belied their fears. I slept soundly until the middle of the following day, and when I did awake, I felt that I was nerved with a new vigour.

The poetry which may be discerned here through the flatness and bad grammar of the translation is strangely marred by the introduction of the warm bed and the sound sleep obtained in it. Waldfried's morality and reflections are apt also to be a little trite. This is the more provoking because there are plenty of keen and valuable observations to be found in the book, but they are never to be found in the mouth of the estimable Waldfried. These, for instance, are some excellent remarks made by two of his sons upon the French character:—

"The French are industrious and temperate, and a people of whom it can be said, that it has a noble destiny awaiting it. They have a great desire to please, which makes them agreeable, and gives all their work the impress of good taste. They are fond of all that partakes of the decorative, whether it be a glittering phrase or a badge. If that which, from its very nature, ought to be general, could gain distinction for them—if there could be an aristocracy in republican virtue, I cannot help believing that Frenchmen would be unbending republicans."

"Yes," said Ludwig; "and they are humane also. The vain and conceited man is usually generous and communicative: he thinks he has so many advantages that he is glad to bestow a share on others, and is annoyed and almost angry if they do not care to accept his bounty; for he considers their declining it is a want of belief in his superiority, and is surprised to find that others do not hunger and thirst for the things that he regards as delicacies."

There are some equally good observations made by a Baron von Arven upon the different qualities of the Prussians and the South Germans:—

When I told him how repellant (*sic*) the angularity and coldness of the Prussians had appeared to me, he said that this was just what he wanted to talk to me about.

He had been exceedingly provoked at their cold-blooded manner. He had already determined to leave them; but after a while he had made up his mind that this sharpness, bitterness and decision were the forces that made them the men they were. Obedience is with them a habit that can be depended on. We South-Germans are too soft and easy-going, and we ought to breathe some of the salt sea-air that blows across that northern country. This want of attention towards others, this disregard of people's feelings, lay in the fact that they had no consideration for themselves. The French who, whatever they do, want to be observed and applauded, will be beaten by these men, whose whole power rests in their self-respect. We used to think the Prussians were braggarts; but now we found no trace of boastfulness, and, in spite of their constant victories, they took every precaution as they advanced, and were prepared for defeat. Yes, orders describing the manner of retreat were issued before every battle.

The most interesting character in the book is Ernst, one of Waldfried's sons, whose wild disposition and unruly ways form an agreeable relief to his father's unwavering and uninteresting steadiness. Ernst distinguishes himself in the first place by betrothing himself to a girl named Martella, whom he finds living with an old woman in a hut in the forest; in the second by quitting his regiment at the beginning of the Austro-Prussian war, because he cannot bear to fight against his countrymen. In the characters of Ernst and Martella there is to be found much of the power of imagination which was displayed in *On the Heights*, and which in its wildest moods was always true to nature. There is much beauty in the description of Martella's untamed nature gradually yielding to the softening influences of home life when she is established with the Waldfried family. But Ernst disappears early from the story, only to reappear for a brief space, during which he finds opportunity to join a German regiment during the Franco-Prussian war, and to die on the battle-field. Martella's death follows hard upon his. It is difficult to take much interest in the fortunes of the other persons of the story after this. With Martella not only does the chief attraction of the book disappear, but also what plot, properly so-called, exists is brought to a conclusion. Rautenkron, one of the characters, is

a forester well known for his hatred of mankind, which is caused by the remembrance of early wrongs. Not a little of his bitterness is at one time vented upon the folly of Waldfried in allowing his son to be betrothed to so wild a creature as Martella, who in the end is discovered to be Rautenkron's own daughter. This is a simple enough mystery, and there is nothing particularly new in it; but it is treated with a skill which makes the secret so exciting while it lasts, and its conclusion so unexpected, that the reader wishes for more of Martella and Ernst and less of Waldfried and his never-ending Diet. Herr Auerbach's last book may possibly be of great value as a series of political sketches; but that is not precisely what one looks for in a romance.

There is now a singular paucity of talent for fiction in Germany, whether in the form of drama, poem, or romance. Herr Freytag, the only German novelist of the day who is at all well known in England besides Herr Auerbach, can hardly be called an imaginative writer. His most popular book, *Soll und Haben*, or as it was called in the English version, *Debit and Credit*, bore unmistakable traces of being modelled upon Dickens. Herr Hackländer displays at times a lively fancy, but neither he nor Herr Freytag deals with the more exalted regions of emotion. Herr Auerbach has done this, and there is proof that he could do so again in the passages of *Waldfried*. One is inclined to resent his having embedded these passages in a mass of political gossip, and sacrificed his imaginative power to his love for detailing history.

#### BURBIDGE'S DOMESTIC FLORICULTURE.\*

THE advance which has been made of late years in the floral adornment of our homes, whether in town or country, both externally and internally, is not easily measurable. But there are some evidences of it which it would be blindness to ignore. The sill of the prosaic sash-window has been enlivened by a box filled with a mixture of ferns, flowers, and succulent plants, whilst its sides are climbed by pretty trailers of infinitely varied colour and foliage. And whereas in other days there was little but ivy, Virginian creeper, jasmine, or an occasional rose to clothe the outer wall surface, and hide the stucco which so many householders have to endure and make the best of—though none in their sound senses would prefer it to stone or brick had they to build again—such is the progress of floriculture as applied to domestic ornament, that now there is any number of climbing and creeping shrubs of diverse scent and blossom available for the disguise of ugly or defective wall-spaces. Nor has the change been less within doors. The palms and agaves which decorate halls and corridors, the ivy screens and inner wall decorations, the arches, pyramids, spires, and festoons of fern and flower which grace the dinner-table, to say nothing of the bouquets in the finger-glasses and the button-holes in the coats, are as much a revolution as the March stands and the Wardian cases; and the time has come for an intelligent manual on these topics from a pen of experience. It is fortunate that Mr. Burbidge has taken up the subject, because his ruling principle is to inculcate that which is attainable by the many, and to discern grace and beauty in a simplicity which can be achieved with a moderate outlay. A study of his volume will furnish modest housekeepers with a number of hints for enhancing the charm of a refined home, and will provide the daughters of such homes with an occupation which may go some way to banish effectually the demon of *ennui*.

Mr. Burbidge has divided his volume into three parts, of which the first relates to the culture of flowers and shrubs in or about the house. The window and the balcony, the hall and the sitting-rooms, offer spaces for floriculture in frames, baskets, pots, brackets, or glazed cases; and our author's first aim is to give counsels and cautions as to the propagation and nurture of plants suitable to each. The second part concerns the ornamental aspects of the subject, and the uses to which cut flowers, dried flowers, flowers in pots and vases, may be put in table or room decoration. The third contains a useful and methodized list of the plants most adapted for these purposes, with a brief account of the history, habitat, scientific and familiar nomenclature of each. Its value is akin to that of a glossary to a chronicle in the *Rolls* series; with the additional advantage that it can be studied in its entirety, besides being used as an appendix of reference.

To survey the capabilities of Mr. Burbidge's subject by the light of this manual, assisted by independent observation of what the loving hands of many an English girl can achieve in her little "window nursery," is to verify the adage "where there's a will there's a way." Given the common sense to select plants that have had some hardening in pots out of doors, and to water them seasonably when selected, the window-box is as susceptible of its floral triumphs as the shrubbery or the parterre. We are introduced in these pages to a mycologist whose area for experimental study of his fungi is a garden of 40 ft. by 30; a microscopist whose animal and vegetable world is a colony in a circular tank 8 ft. in diameter by 2 ft. in depth; and an artist whose designs in wood owe their graceful touches of vegetation to the tastefully filled "hanging basket, which is suspended beneath the skylight that lights his studio." Patience is as possible, if not as common, as inventiveness; and we are persuaded that it is in the power of all who will heed, as well as read, the divers plans detailed in this manual for propagating, cherishing, and rearing window-flowers, to

\* *Domestic Floriculture, Window Gardening, and Floral Decorations.* With 200 Engravings on Wood. By F. W. Burbidge. Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1874.

ensure unfailing delights of vegetable form, shape, and colour with as much certainty as if they had the most roomy and sumptuous of conservatories. And if patience is lacking for the tedious process of taking and striking cuttings and so forth, we have but to resort to Mr. Peter Barr's ingenious invention of a heated propagating case, which has been so far tested as to prove its usefulness in striking cuttings, raising seedlings, and duly preserving tender and delicate plants. Those who prefer the less royal and compendious road will find help from the hints on manuring, sponging, fumigating, and watering their pets, which are given in detail in the first part; and they cannot lay too deeply to heart the sound advice of Mr. D. Thompson as to their treatment in winter, the gist of which is, "in wintering plants where fire heat cannot be applied, to keep them dry and give them rest in the latter part of autumn, and in winter; to cover them up loosely in frost, to uncover them gently and gradually in thaw; and to spare water except where it is actually essential to life" (pp. 64-6).

For the minute directions by following which the external window-box may be maintained "a thing of beauty and a joy" all the year round we must refer our readers to the book before us; but we may specially draw their attention to the woodcuts in pp. 90-1, which represent "a simple window-garden in winter," and "a winter balcony-garden." This is to regard the art at its most critical and difficult point. In spring and summer there are ways and means of perpetual variety and attraction, but here is grace attainable out of doors at a time and season when all nature might have been expected to be creeping into shelter. The following are the materials of the winter window-box:—

A plant of common ivy is planted at either end of the box and trained over a wire hoop; it forms a neat ornamental arch. The central part below is *Retinospora ericoides*, but any other tapering shrub, as *Thuja aurea*, or *T. Bonnianna*, may be used instead. The plants on either side are golden variegated *Euonymus*, which contrasts well with a blue juniper in the centre, or the fresh green ivy above. The surface of the box may be covered with any dwarf trailing plants, mossy *Saxifrages*, *Arabis alba*, or the variegated forms, *Aubretia purpurea*, or the fresh green *Sedum acre* (common stone-crop), all of which are suitable. A few bulbs of *crocus*, *snowdrop*, *scilla*, *hyacinth*, *aconite*, may be inserted, as these will brighten up the box during the first sunny days of spring before it is time to plant summer flowers. In some cases the ivy arch may be left till summer, as it forms a fresh background for the canary creeper, or the *Convolvulus major*, besides contrasting well with the flowering plants below.

The winter balcony figured in p. 91 owes its charm to vases of the *Yucca recurva* as the central attraction, but surrounded by masses of fresh green ivy covering the front balustrades and springing from boxes of soil on the balcony itself. Either for the outside or the inside of a window there is no prettier or more effective adornment than the "hanging-basket," the larger the better, so far as proportion to the width of window or balcony will admit. Once suitably filled, one of these will last for years, with very occasional attention. For the exterior, the plants of the hanging-basket must be hardy, or half-hardy; for the interior, most of those tenderer subjects which do well in pots within doors are available. But even the former admits of ivies, *Alpine strawberries*, and spring flowering bulbs, with a substratum and surrounding of living mosses. Autumn is the best time for filling these baskets with spring-flowering bulbs; and the materials of which they may be composed are more various than one would at first conceive. Mr. Burbidge gives a choice of these, beginning with a cross-cut turnip or beetroot, and ending with a light wooden frame covered and ornamented by pine or fir cones.

But we must leave the department of culture to glance at the author's no less interesting hints as to floral ornament. These cover a wide field, and forcibly inculcate the need of taste, selection, and forbearance in the use of floral decoration. "Floral decorations," he writes, "are generally attractive when arranged by tasteful loving fingers at home, and if we grow our own flowers as well, we derive additional pleasure and enjoyment from their use as domestic adornments." There is indeed a world of meaning in the qualifying adverb "generally," for it is always needful to be able to distinguish a bouquet from a bow pot; and there are few diners-out who have not been outraged at one time or another by the crowding of *épergnes* or centre-pieces with blossoms to the exclusion of foliage, or *vice versa*, or by the allotment of bouquets fitter for a jary of the old coaching days than for a guest in these modern days of delicacy in floriculture. Mr. Burbidge is full of valuable hints as to the mechanism of bouquets—a matter of not the less consequence because it does strike the uninitiated eye; he enlightens us as to the longer duration of the beautiful *Eucharis*, the *Stephanotis*, and the *Gardenia*, than that of the more popular and more widely affected *Camellia*. For foliage in bouquet, wreath, or training round the standards of the "March glasses" (March stands and March glasses are explained at pp. 135, 144), he recommends, in addition to myrtle shoots, the graceful feathery spray of the *Asparagus scandens* and *Asparagus consanguineus*, or the glossy-leaved branches of the Boston vine (*Myrsiphyllum*, p. 122). This last is a notion from America, whence, too, our bridal parties might borrow the institution of a "Bridal Bell," which with our Transatlantic cousins is "as indispensable as the ceremony itself." Hung in front of the pier-glass, its framework "is of wire, and it is made up of camellias, tuberose, carnations, all pure white. The balls are made of the same flowers, and have on them a monogram in red, blue, or green, as the fancy may suggest." On the subject of table decoration Mr. Burbidge has much to say that commends itself to sound sense and taste—as, for instance, the hint borrowed from a royal confectioner, and transferred from fruits to

flowers, to garnish each subject as far as possible with its own leaves. He also justly discourages the blending together of fruits and flowers in decoration, as being an inhospitable mode of tying the hands of your guests. In such a case it might be as well to have sham fruit. But we think he is too tolerant of the absurd modern device of sham table-tops, designed to foster the delusion or illusion that the palms and cycads which adorn the festive board are growing out of the mahogany, which in point of fact has been removed to make way for a perforated deal substitute. We are glad to learn that the device is not yet generally adopted, for it is hard to see what objection there can be to the graceful and ornamental forms of earthenware now turned out by the potter. Even if, however, there be an objection to nude pots, it is very easy to make them presentable by the primitive and Adamic leaf-drapery, which is far better than gaudy paper, and infinitely superior to the silly table-dodge. We could have wished that some notice had been taken of the general tendency of the fashionable glass flower-vases for table use to be too thin-stemmed to admit of a due amount of internal washing; though it seems ill-natured to hunt for omissions when so much useful information is afforded. One of the happiest uses of glass stands on the table is to hold wild and cultivated grasses, and here we may see how taste can achieve triumphs of decoration at a very trifling outlay. A new and strange field is opened out in the mixture of skeletonized and dried foliage with grasses in bouquets and decorative vases. The processes of drying and skeletonizing which are here given have been borrowed, as the author states, from the pleasant pages of the *Garden*. To return for a moment to the living flowers, which most persons will prefer to see on the table, it is sound advice to prefer reds and whites to hues which are less effective by candle-light, such as blue, purple, lilac, or mauve.

We must briefly notice the practical description of plants which makes up the concluding part of Mr. Burbidge's volume. Alphabetical in form, this description might strike the reader as wearisome of perusal; but its use will be found whenever the student of floral decoration requires to inform himself (or more often perhaps herself) of the available representatives of a particular class of flowers. Say, for instance, that we are in search of hardy climbers to cover a trellis, a balustrade, or a window-side. Nothing that we know beats the Virginian creeper, but it may be that we want a variety or a contrast. For the first this list will give us *Ampelopsis Veitchii tricuspidata*, a creeper with three-lobed bright green foliage, changing in autumn to a purplish crimson, and for the second the bold, large-leaved, bright green *Aristolochia Siphio*, a climber which fully justifies its name. A wider search will furnish hardy climbers in the North American *Adlumia purpurea*, which may be grown from seed in spring, and in blossom is not unlike the *Dielytras*; the *Akebia quinata*, a five-lobed hardy climber with dark foliage and clusters of deep purple flowers. Less known perhaps is the tolerably hardy, quick-growing, and sweet-scented climber from the Andes, with fragrant greenish-white blossom and large heart-shaped foliage, named *Boussingaultia Baselloides* (p. 242); to which we might add the *Cissus antarctica*, the *Cobaea scandens*, and divers kinds of *convolvulus*, to say nothing of a very useful climber which has been long known to us, but has gone somewhat out of fashion, the hardy and much to be commended *Ecemocarpus scaber*. After all, however, it would be hard to eclipse the common white jasmine (*Jasminum officinale*), a plant of unmatched perfume which is less prized and planted than it deserves.

Reverting for a moment to the tenants of the window-box, we see that Mr. Burbidge recommends as such the scarcely yet appreciated Cape bulbs, *Ixia*, *Sparaxis*, *Tritonia*, &c. In a proper compost on a sandy bottom they will do well in the open air, and they appreciate a dry airy atmosphere. Any one who happened to see Messrs. Hoopers' stand of these at the Horticultural Society's first show at South Kensington last year will have had the amplest evidence "that a good collection of the flower spikes of these bulbs will hold its own as lovely flowers against all comers, orchids not excepted."

Mr. Burbidge's book is meritoriously free from fine writing. Though flowers and their culture sometimes engender sentimentalism, he very rarely gives vent to such fancies as the fitness of *trailing ivy* to wreath "the portrait of a departed friend." At the same time he writes well and sensibly. Our only query is as to the authority for the epithet "*short-lived*" (p. 237). The woodcuts are excellent and apposite, and, in short, the book is a valuable accession to the horticulturist's library.

#### AMERICAN LITERATURE.

VERY few American families retain for any length of time a high political position. If we were to seek the representatives of those who bore a chief part in the Revolution we might find them, no doubt, despite the breaking up of estates and the consequent rapid dissipation even of the largest fortunes, among the social aristocracy of the older States; but, except in the South, the very fact of their hereditary reputation tends to bar rather than to smooth their way to a public career. Of the great names belonging to the first generation of Federal statesmen and soldiers in the Northern States, there is but one that has been constantly represented in the public life of America, or whose bearers are at this moment known beyond their own country, or known there as public men. Randolph or Randall is still an honoured name in Virginia, and the family of Washington, as well as that



of one of his most distinguished lieutenants, was represented in the second struggle for independence by the foremost of the Virginian gentry and the greatest of Confederate soldiers; while not a few of the best names in Georgia and the Carolinas figure equally in both the great wars in which their States have been engaged. But in New England the one family which has held a distinguished place in public life through three generations is that of Adams, represented in former times by two of the most eminent, if not most popular, Presidents, and in our own by the foremost of American diplomatists, and more than one of the most respected citizens of Massachusetts. This peculiar distinction, as well as his own political eminence and high personal reputation, lends an especial interest to the memoirs of the second Adams\*, edited as they are, or rather compiled, by the principal representative of the family in the third generation, the late Envoy of the United States at the Court of St. James's. John Quincy Adams was even a more distinguished man than his father, despite the more exciting times and more memorable circumstances in which the latter played a leading part; and he stands in many respects among the most remarkable figures in American history. The elder Adams was over-shadowed by several of the contemporaries with whom he was brought into closest relations; he was a civilian in a time when everything was staked on the issue of battle, and all eyes were fixed on the men of the sword—a diplomatist absent from his country during a critical part of her struggle for independence. It is rather to the fact that Massachusetts has been the chief historian of the war, and has had good reason for exaggerating and colouring her own part therein, than to his real eminence as an actor in the great drama, that he owes his present rank on the file of revolutionary heroes; while even as a Federalist politician he was less important than Hamilton, and, if the latter had lived to attain the Presidency, the former would have been reduced to an altogether secondary place in the early history of the Union. John Quincy Adams, on the other hand, by force of character and dignity of temper, won for himself a place quite apart among the public men of his time. After his retirement or rather ejection from the Presidency, he, alone among American Presidents, returned to a humbler but not less useful, and perhaps hardly less powerful, place in public life. He stooped to sit in the House of Representatives, and to wield there a moral authority even greater than Peel in his last years held in our House of Commons, in many respects above party, yet on most questions espousing what was then the cause of the minority, and giving weight and dignity to that cause, too generally disgraced by the intemperance of Abolitionist demagogues, by the stern and determined stand he made, in the name of constitutional principles and public liberties, against the retaliatory encroachments of the exasperated Democrats. No other President exercised any influence on public affairs after his resignation. Mr. Adams was, to the end of his life, a high authority on the great constitutional issues that were coming to the front in the struggle of factions, and one to whom, had serious peril threatened them while he lived, the whole nation would naturally have turned, not perhaps for unbiassed, but for wise and high-minded, counsel. He belonged moreover to the earlier and nobler class of American statesmen; those who were at once gentlemen by birth and education, acknowledged as equals and fit associates by the diplomatists of Europe, and competent judges of the popular needs and tendencies of a country ever inclining more and more to a pure social democracy. He was the last of the elder series of Presidents who were selected exclusively from among this class of statesmen. From his fall dated the ascendancy of wirepullers, the doctrine that "to the victors belong the spoils," and the choice of Presidents either from among the rougher class of soldiers or the second-rate politicians "who had no record" that could offend any section of their possible supporters. The present volume deals only with the earlier part of Adams's life. It treats, first, of his boyhood, a great part of which was spent in accompanying his father on his European missions, and which was prematurely terminated by his introduction to the work of the Secretariate and to the *élite* of political society, to which even the ordinary subalterns of an important embassy, and much more the son of its chief, always have access, and which was in those days brighter and more attractive in a social point of view than at present. We have next his return to America, his preparation for the Bar, his participation in political controversies, especially those arising out of the conduct of Genet, the first ambassador of the French Republic to the United States, and the consequent notice of Washington, then President, which led to his selection of young Adams as American Minister to the United Provinces, at that time in the agony of a revolution enforced by foreign interposition, and his entrance by this road into a political career which he never quitted till his death. While in Holland Adams was despatched on a special mission to London, which occupies a considerable space in the volume. For, on his original appointment, the young Minister began to keep a regular and elaborate journal, a practice which he never discontinued, and which has furnished the greater portion of the present work; and his interest in England, in English politics, and in the society of Englishmen of both parties, led him to record at great length his social and personal experiences during his stay in London. His mind was evidently bitterly prejudiced, and it is obvious that his party feeling for the French Republic led him vastly to overrate the power of the English Op-

position, which fell to pieces through internal dissensions, and became contemptible and odious in the public eye as soon as it embraced the cause of the national enemy. But the diary of an American visitor to London in the days of Pitt and Fox, containing full accounts of important and intimate political conversations, as well as of the impression made on his mind by what he saw of English life, scenery, and society, cannot but be interesting to Englishmen; more so than the account of his mission to Portugal and Prussia, and the minute diary of his work in the Senate of Massachusetts, and subsequently in that of the United States, which occupy the remainder of these 550 large octavo pages, and bring us down to the year 1809.

Among the most important, but not certainly the most readable, works on our list is a collection of reports, maps, diagrams, sketches, and plans relating to the various routes proposed for the Canadian Pacific Railway\*, and the country through which it has to pass. Beginning with Lake Nipissing, a comparatively small piece of water north of Lake Huron, which is taken as representing the terminus of the Canadian and Atlantic system of railway communication, the engineers employed have explored great part of the country lying between a line drawn from the southern extremity of Hudson's Bay to the Great Lakes and the Pacific Coast in the neighbourhood of Vancouver's Island, and have marked out, and more or less completely surveyed in outline, six possible routes, not absolutely distinct in all parts, but affording a choice of all the most important points, and in the most difficult regions. They divide the country into three parts:—the woodland region immediately west of Ottawa, and north-west of Lake Superior, extending from Lake Nipissing and its neighbourhood on the one hand to Lake Winnipeg, the Red River, and Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis on the other. From these last the prairie region extends westward to the Rocky Mountain chain, which in these latitudes is subdivided, the main, but lower, chain following the general course of these mountains, and keeping at some distance inland, the Cascade chain lying in the immediate neighbourhood of the coast. Between these two chains there is a plateau, generally higher than the passes, by which apparently, if the maps may be trusted, a railway may be carried through the mountains themselves. The woodland region appears to present no extraordinary obstacles; the prairie region is rather easy than otherwise; and it does not seem that the passage of the Rocky Mountains or of the plateau or mountain region offers any difficulties which, considering what has been done in the Alps, and in the United States immediately to the southward of this line, ought to alarm engineers. We should judge that the main difficulties are in the ascent from the Pacific shore to the passes of the Cascade chain, which lie in some places almost close to the inlets of fiords of that strange shore-line, not a little resembling the glacier-formed coast of Norway and of Greenland. To make the head of one of these deep and sheltered inlets the landing-place of ships and the starting-point of the line would obviously, if practicable, be convenient; but it is here that the explorers appear to recognize their chief difficulty, and to doubt, not exactly whether the thing can be done, but whether it can be done at a cost which the Government and Parliament of the Dominion will sanction. A mere glance at the map suggests that it would be far easier to perfect the line of water communication, which seems to be broken only in one or two places, than to carry a railway right across some two thousand and seven hundred miles of territory almost entirely uninhabited, and much of which has never been traversed till now. But, to say nothing of the probability that the water routes may be entirely closed for six months out of twelve, the Canadian Government is bound by the terms of union with the Pacific colonies to complete a railway within a given and not very long period, and seems to be thoroughly desirous to accomplish its undertaking loyally and exactly. The report of the chief of the expedition contains some important facts respecting the resources of the country thus annexed to the Dominion, which the railway will knit effectually to the general system of the Empire. To say nothing of Columbian gold, Vancouver's Island contains coal and iron, lying together in quantities sufficient for the needs of a gigantic trade; and the fiords of the neighbouring coast are such that our largest ironclads might sail inland eighty miles, right into the heart of the Cascade chain. The country generally offers greater attractions to settlers than many parts of the United States which have nevertheless been fully settled, and the water-routes of which we have spoken, if not fit substitutes for a railway, might be so far completed by light portage lines, and so forth, as to assist in promoting immigration ahead and in advance of the railway, if once it was understood that the railway was coming.

A new edition of Professor Agassiz's *Lectures on the Structure of Animal Life*†, if here and there an argument may seem to be modified or rendered questionable by some new geological discovery, or to require alteration to meet new statements of the Darwinian theory, still retains all its original interest and value. Its purpose, we may venture to remind our readers, is to show that the geological order in which creatures appeared on the earth is inconsistent with

\* *Canadian Pacific Railway*. Sandford Fleming, Engineer-in-Chief. Report of Progress on the Explorations and Surveys up to January 1874. Ottawa: M'Lean, Roger, & Co. London: Trübner & Co.; Sampson Low & Co. 1874.

† *The Structure of Animal Life*. Six Lectures delivered at the Brooklyn Academy of Music in January and February 1862. By Louis Agassiz, late Director of the Museum of Comparative Zoology. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1874.

\* *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams; comprising Portions of his Diary from 1795 to 1848*. Edited by Charles Francis Adams. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1874.

the theory of succession by descent; the highest development of one class being followed in time by the lowest development of another—that is, by something not higher, but lower in the general scale of creation, than itself; in short, that creation moves, not in a direct line, but in a series of parallel lines. Possibly Mr. Darwin would admit nearly all of M. Agassiz's statements without allowing that they weaken his case; but as the counter-statements of a naturalist equal in authority, they are certainly worth reading in connexion with Mr. Darwin's publications.

If we rightly understand the *Anæsthetic Revelation*\*, which is stated in terms better suited to the mysticism of mediæval alchemists than to the plain and painstaking lucidity of modern discoverers who really have something to relate; if we appreciate the "gist of philosophy" hidden somewhere or other in this thin volume amidst pages on pages of verbiage that can bear no relation to the gist of anything—we incline to fancy that the writer means to convey that his experience of chloroform has taught him that the intelligent Ego (not that he uses a word conveying so definite an idea) can be temporarily deprived of the consciousness which is its very essence; and that therefore there is no reason to believe in its immortality. There is nothing on this subject, however—nothing of argument or of fact, of physiology or metaphysics—which is not familiar to every one who has ever thought about the action of anæsthetics at all; while there is a mass of irrelevant rubbish that will prevent any one but a critic from ever reaching the gist of the book at all, small as it is.

Another circle-squarer, ignorant as usual that the proportion of the circumference to the radius has been ascertained and shown to belong to the class of incommensurables and represented by an interminable decimal, sets to work to solve the old problem in four thin volumes, a supplement, and a series of plates, and indignantly appeals to the public because the men of science will not listen to him. Generally, these crotchety mongers have hit on some very simple and easily disposable absurdity; but Mr. John Harris bewilders himself through a lengthy series of demonstrations equal in extent to a couple of books of Euclid; and if he fails to fix the attention of mathematicians the public at least are safe; the absurdity and the refutation will alike fly over their heads.

The same publisher prints what appears to be an official Report on the Fossil Plants of the Lower Carboniferous Formations of Canada †, addressed by Dr. J. W. Dawson, F.R.S., to Mr. Selwyn, the Director of the Government Geological Survey of the Dominion.

Dr. Matthews, Professor of English Literature at Chicago University, publishes a collection of essays ‡ rather above the average of those that appear in magazines under similar titles. The first which gives its name to the book is a misnomer, for several of the "great conversers" whose fame it records never joined in conversation at all, though willing and indeed eager to talk, and talking excellently, if nobody else presumed to claim a share of attention. "Epigrams," "Popular Fallacies," "Is Literature Ill-paid?" "The Battle of Waterloo," and so forth, are all good enough to while away half an hour in train or waiting-room, and good enough therefore for a magazine, but on not a single topic treated in this volume has the writer anything to say which he or any one else could wish to remember. Why, then, take them from their native oblivion in order to collect and republish them as a book without coherence, and without the original excuse which the character of magazine literature affords?

*The World on Wheels*|| is a lively but not very instructive sketch of different methods of modern locomotion—stage-coaches, horseback journeys, railways, ships, steamers, with the different scenery that belongs to each; a very slight and sketchy book, which we should have supposed to have been written for the sake of the illustrations, had the latter been worth publication on their own account.

Messrs. Putnam's *Handbook of the Statistics of the United States*¶ is rather an historical and political than a statistical work. Almost the only statistics it contains are those of receipts and expenditures. It is too meagre to be valuable as a book of reference; and it throws too little light on the kind of subjects on which the public wants information to be valuable as a hand-book.

*Saxe Holm's Stories*\*\* belong to a class of books more numerous, and we think better, in America than here; collections of short tales, often by authors of established repute, either moral, sentimental, or simply illustrative of striking points of American life. Most of them are "ower gude for banning and ower bad for blessing"; but even so they are infinitely better than nine English novels in ten, and they have the invaluable merit of being much shorter. The present volume is a superior specimen of its class.

\* *The Anæsthetic Revelation and the Gist of Philosophy*. By Benjamin Paul Blood. Amsterdam, N. Y. London: Trübner & Co. 1874.

† *The Circle and Straight Line*. By John Harris. Montreal: J. Lovell. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1874.

‡ *Geological Survey of Canada*. A. R. C. Selwyn, F.G.S., Director. Report on the Fossil Plants of the Lower Carboniferous and Millstone Grit Formations of Canada. By J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., F.G.S. Montreal: J. Lovell. London: Trübner & Co. 1874.

§ *The Great Conversers, and other Essays*. By W. Matthews, LL.D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Chicago. Chicago: Griggs & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1874.

|| *The World on Wheels, and other Sketches*. Chicago: Griggs & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1874.

¶ *Handbook of Statistics of the United States*. Compiled by M. C. Spaulding. New York: Putnam Sons. 1874.

\*\* *Saxe Holm's Stories*. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1874.

We cannot say the same of any of the volumes of verse on our table. *Northern Ballads*\* are good old tales ill told. *Thurid*† is full of bad verse and versified prose, and both require to be read more than once in order to apprehend the meaning. *The Winter of the Heart*‡ shows vigour here and there, but it is rather power of expression than of thought or feeling; and in all three the writers have forgotten that the first condition of versification, to say nothing of poetry, is to know what you mean to say, and to be able to say it as straightforwardly and simply in rhyme as in prose. He who cannot do this is liable at any moment to be run away with not by his thought but by his tools, and hurried into utter rant and nonsense.

\* *Northern Ballads*. By Edward L. Anderson. New York: Carleton & Co. 1874.

† *Thurid, and other Poems*. By G. E. O. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1874.

‡ *The Winter of the Heart, and other Poems*. By Zavarr Wilmschurst. New York: Dodd & Mead.

#### NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

#### THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 6d., or \$7 50 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 17 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

#### PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 58 Boulevard de Strasbourg.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW Bill of Contents will be forwarded every Friday Evening by post, prepaid, to any Newsagent in Town or Country on application to the Publisher.

Now ready, VOLUME XXXVII., bound in cloth, price 16s. Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each. May be had at the Office, or through any Bookseller.

## THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

#### CONTENTS OF No. 978, JULY 25, 1874:

Ministers at the Mansion House. The Endowed Schools Bill. The Russian Government and the Rules of War. The *Wyllie* Roads. Marshal MacMahon and the Republic. Election Petitions. The Lord's Committee on Church Patronage. Public Opinion and the Indian Famine.

Collections. The Man and Dog Fight. Two more Days on the Berkshire Downs. "Bloody Gardiner." Life Assurance. Rational Law-Making. Prosecution of the Jockey Club. The Italian Operas.

Persia, Ancient and Modern. Fronde's English in Ireland—Vol. III. Bendin on Glaciers. Young Brown. The Seven Ages of a Village Pauper. Joan of Arc and the Times of Charles the Seventh. Waldfried. Eschridge's Domestic Floriculture. American Literature.

#### CONTENTS OF No. 977, JULY 18, 1874:

Prince Bismarck—Mr. Disraeli on Public Business—Marshal MacMahon and the Republic—Mr. Disraeli and Ritualism—The late Lord Derby—Legal Education—The Revenue Returns—The Endowed Schools Bill—The Bengal Famine. Monuments—Women and University Degrees—A Hundred a Year—Law, History, and Sir William Harcourt—The Flying Man—The Swiss Federal Court—The Midland Railway and Poor Evictions—French Plays—The Paris Salon—The Italian Operas.

Montécut's Burgundy—Fronde's English in Ireland. Vol. II.—My Time, and What I've Done with It—Romanism in Russia—Reginald Hetheridge—Charles Howard, Earl of Carlisle—Guards and Line—My Mother and I—German Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.